UNDERSTANDING THE NEXUS BETWEEN EARLY LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS, EMERGENT BILINGUAL LEARNERS, AND LANGUAGE POLICY IN BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

Julie Casper

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education in
Teachers College, Columbia University

2021

ABSTRACT

UNDERSTANDING THE NEXUS BETWEEN EARLY LEARNING AND DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS, EMERGENT BILINGUAL LEARNERS, AND LANGUAGE POLICY IN BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

Julie Casper

This study explored the interplay between early learning and development standards (ELDS) and emergent bilingual learners (EBLs) in PreK classrooms in Boston, Massachusetts. The study explored how preschool teachers and policy experts understand ELDS, and how teachers integrate ELDS with their practice generally, and specifically with regard to EBLs. To do so, it sought to understand the ways in which EBLs are positioned in Massachusetts' ELDS; how ELDS are understood, perceived, and enacted in general education, sheltered English immersion (SEI), and dual language PreK classrooms; and how state and district level education policy experts perceive the relationships between Massachusetts language policy, ELDS, and the needs of young EBLs. The study contextualized ELDS within a sociocultural framework in order to provide an understanding of the role of standards in the early education of EBLs. Employing

qualitative interviews and a review of ELDS documents, the study was situated within the context of the Massachusetts 2002 Question 2 legislation, which banned bilingual education and instead instituted SEI classrooms.

The researcher found that Vygotsky and Rogoff's sociocultural theories of learning were helpful in framing understandings of ELDS in their development and in practice. Using this lens allowed for depth in understanding the power dynamics in the development of ELDS, including reflecting on the dominant benchmarks considered in the writing of standards. As part of a systemic approach to educational equity, ELDS should be carefully reviewed within the context of a Eurocentric orientation in order to influence their nature. Using a sociocultural theoretical lens also allowed for depth in understanding ELDS implementation, including how children's native languages and cultures are impacted by perceptions of EBL ability and achievement. The study offers suggestions including: reviewing and consolidating standards; changes to education and professional development (pre-service and in-service); policy changes in entry procedures for EBLs; more nuanced understandings of the inherent biases that undergird serving this population equitably; a heteroglossic view of dual language assessments; increasing workforce diversity; supporting paraprofessionals; improved communication with families; increased monitoring and feedback of ELDS; reconciling state and district early childhood work expectations; and an increased policy focus on EBLs.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

DEDICATION

For my children—may they find the courage, dedication, and perseverance to make a difference.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Throughout this journey, I had the support of a number of individuals who provided me with encouragement, advice, and open and honest feedback. They gave selflessly of their time, for which I am forever grateful.

I am extremely thankful for the guidance of my sponsor, advisor, and mentor, Sharon Lynn Kagan. Her mentorship and high standards helped me become a stronger writer and better scholar, and with her support, I have grown professionally, academically, and personally. This work would simply not have been possible without her.

I am grateful for the contribution of Mariana Souto-Manning, who was instrumental in my growth and development, and who coached me on theory and research methods during our conversations. I also extend my thanks to Celia Genishi, whose own work inspired me and who graciously participated on my defense committee.

I am especially grateful for my family for their unconditional love and support, and for being behind me every step of the way since this journey began. My parents, Cheryl and Bill, instilled in me a belief in education and hard work that inspired me. They pushed me to do my best and had faith that I would complete this journey. My siblings, Lindsay and Michael, helped me tirelessly with their feedback and words of encouragement. Their devotion made this possible, and I share this accomplishment with them.

Most of all, I could never have done this without my best friend and husband, Josh, who has been my rock and—without complaint—stood by my side throughout this process. His unwavering love, patience, and belief in me helped me to accomplish this goal.

J. C.

Chapter I – INTRODUCTION

When Kevin bounces into his PreK classroom, his eagerness to play in the block area, learn to cut with scissors, and climb on the playground equipment matches that of his peers. While he is, ostensibly, a well-adjusted four-year-old boy, statistically he is slated to significantly fall behind his peers academically over the course of his schooling. This is because Kevin is an EBL—an emergent bilingual learner—and as such, he is likely to face an increasing onslaught of challenges over his schooling tenure. Though a broadly defined category, the term EBL is used by scholars to refer to a young student who speaks a primary language other than English, and whose emergent bilingualism is understood to be a cognitive and social resource (García, 2009). The number of young EBL students in the United States is rapidly growing, with over four million EBL students enrolled in early childhood education (ECE) programs across the country (World-class Instructional Design and Assessment [WIDA], 2015).

Pinpointing where EBLs begin to face the many challenges that factor into their academic underachievement is highly nuanced and far too complex to address in one research study. This research looks specifically at early learning and development standards (ELDS) as one mechanism for advancing student learning that is frequently implemented in early childhood classrooms, with a focus on EBLs. Indeed, the ELDS implemented in PreK classrooms have the potential to challenge some of the fundamental tenets and learning theories that have framed traditional early childhood education, with wide-ranging ramifications for EBLs.

This study explores the relationship between sociocultural theories of learning and the ways in which ELDS do and do not promote the development and learning of young

linguistically minoritized preschool-aged learners. This relationship is understood through the voices of various education stakeholders, including preschool teachers and state and district level education policy experts. Viewing the stakeholder experience through a sociocultural framework that explains how children learn language and develop, the study employs theories from Lev Vygotsky and Barbara Rogoff, in addition to theories on linguistic interdependence.

Using Boston, Massachusetts as the locale, this qualitative study explores how EBLs are positioned in ELDS documents, and how preschool teachers and state and district education policy experts experience and understand the effects of early learning and development standards on EBLs in preschool programs. The Boston public preschool programs selected for this study reflect some of the diversity in types of preschool models that Boston area children attend, including general education PreK classrooms (for all children, taught in English), sheltered English immersion (SEI) classrooms (which emphasize English-only instruction in the classroom), and dual-language classrooms (where half the students are speakers of the program's partner language and half are English speakers, with the goal that students will become bilingual or biliterate).

Not only is the study situated in Boston, but it sits amidst the Massachusetts statewide legislation of 2002, known as Question 2, which banned bilingual education and instead instituted SEI for all students including preschool children. This legislation is a situated representation of a broader trend in dismantling bilingual education through ballot propositions. Widespread criticism of Question 2 resulted in the 2017 passage of the LOOK Act, which outlines a plan to provide EBL students with more bilingual education options. Massachusetts is a national leader in early education and care for young children, collaborating across various levels of government and departments to develop a unified system that aligns standards,

curriculum and assessments. Yet while Boston has distinguished itself for its strong early childhood program, in 2010 the United States Department of Justice sued Boston Public Schools for failing to adequately prepare teachers to work with EBL students. These various factors make Boston, Massachusetts a contemporarily salient locale in which to study the implementation of ELDS for EBLs.

To capitalize on this context, this study explores the extent to which the Question 2 legislation influences teacher attitudes and perceptions of standards documents as well as their reported feelings towards working with EBL students on the implementation of the standards. The study also looks at eleven sets of ELDS documents that pertain to Massachusetts to serve as context and to help discern how EBLs are positioned within the standards documents, including: 1) Guidelines for Preschool Learning Experiences (2003); 2) Guidelines for Preschool and Kindergarten Learning Experiences (Draft, 2017); 3) Massachusetts Standards for PreK and K: Social and Emotional Learning, and Approaches to Play and Learning (2015); 4) WIDA Early English Language Development Standards (2014); and 5-11) Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks, which include those for Art, English Language Arts, Health, Mathematics, Foreign Languages, History and Social Science, and Science and Technology.

This study aims to understand the ways in which preschool teachers and policy experts make sense of ELDS in order to provide compelling data that has the potential to impact programmatic, district, and state level policy as well as improve higher education certification programs, teacher education, and teacher practices. As such, study findings may also inform statewide revisions to ELDS documents as well as policies on teacher education, with the goal of better equipping teachers to work with their EBL students. Moreover, findings from this study may help address disproportional education outcomes between EBL students and their

monolingual English-speaking peers. The study is critically important for the far-reaching implications it could have on early childhood education and emergent bilingual learners across Massachusetts as well as nationwide.

1.1 Statement of Purpose and Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to understand the interplay between ELDS and EBLs in PreK classrooms in Boston, Massachusetts. Given that ELDS are designed to improve teaching and learning, it sought to understand how preschool teachers and policy personnel themselves understand these standards. Moreover, it sought to understand how teachers integrate ELDS with their practice generally, and specifically with regard to their EBL students. To do so, it sought to understand the ways in which EBLs are positioned in ECE Massachusetts' standards; how ELDS are understood, perceived, and enacted in PreK classrooms in Boston; and how state and district level education policy experts perceive the relationships between Massachusetts language policy, ELDS, and the needs of young EBL students. By asking about perceptions and attitudes of teachers and policy experts regarding ELDS in the research questions, the study hoped to contextualize ELDS within a sociocultural framework in order to provide an understanding of the role of standards in the early education of EBLs.

The research questions themselves consider many contexts—such as teacher education, teacher values and biases, and the Massachusetts Question 2 legislation, that may influence the extent within which teachers and policy experts make sense of and implement ELDS. To that end, the research questions that guided this inquiry are:

1. How are EBLs positioned in written ECE Massachusetts' standards documents and guidelines?
2. How do preschool teachers across different Boston public preschool program types

(general education, SEI, dual language) perceive the relationships between Massachusetts' language policy, ELDS, and the needs of their young EBL students?

3. How do preschool teachers across different Boston public preschool program types (general education, SEI, dual language) report utilizing ELDS to scaffold the learning and development of EBLs:
    a. How do they convey their general attitudes and perceptions regarding using ELDS?
    b. How do they report having been prepared to use ELDS in their instruction, both generally and specifically for EBLs?
    c. How do they report using ELDS in their instruction?
    d. How do they report using ELDS to address language acquisition and cultural diversity?
4. How do state and district level education policy experts perceive the relationships between Massachusetts' language policy, ELDS, and the needs of young EBL students?

1.2 Statement of the Problem

This research is grounded in the documented academic underachievement[1] of EBL students across the country and specifically in Massachusetts (García et al., 2008; Halle et al., 2009). It looks to one of the predominant tools in the early childhood education classroom—

[1] The term "achievement gap" is widely referenced throughout this paper because it is commonly used in policy and education literature. While not subscribing to this term, it is important to situate it within a Eurocentric construct that places the burden of the gap on the student. A more appropriate term than achievement gap is "education debt," which lifts the burden off the individual and acknowledges the accumulation of the historical, economic, sociopolitical, and moral decisions that contribute to educational inequities in our society (Ladson-Billings, 2006). These include a legacy of educational inequities in the United States, disparities in education funding between schools, exclusion from decision-making mechanisms and political capital, and recognizing our personal and social responsibility to do the right thing for minoritized children.

early learning and development standards—and examines their implementation for EBLs within the context of: (i) the ways in which the ELDS do/do not address EBLs; (ii) Question 2 and new language policies; and (iii) teacher preparation for teaching EBLs. These influences on the use of ELDS are posited as variables that can potentially shed light unto the EBL experience in preschool classrooms. Indeed, the passage of Question 2 in Massachusetts, with its rejection of transitional bilingual education in favor of SEI, has the potential to influence the perceived relationship between ELDS and EBLs. Moreover, the centrality of ELDS to the entire learning experience of young children renders this analysis formative for understanding the experiences for EBL children in many early education classrooms.

1.2.1 The EBL challenge and young children

EBL children disproportionately lag behind their monolingual English-speaking peers, achieving far lower levels of proficiency on state standardized exams as well as in other large-scale content assessments (Child Trends, 2019). Importantly, these differences begin prior to kindergarten (García et al., 2008; Halle et al., 2009) and continue through high school (Horn, 2003; Kieffer et al., 2009; Solano-Flores & Trumbull, 2003). The majority of EBLs from Spanish-speaking households, for example, enter kindergarten and complete assessments that identify them as having lower literacy skills than their peers from monolingual English-speaking households (Espinosa, 2013; Rumberger & Tran, 2006). As this gap manifests even prior to kindergarten entry, known as the school readiness gap, it has garnered national attention, with many advocating for the expansion of quality formal prekindergarten programs for all children (Gottfried & Kim, 2015; Shonkoff & Phillips, 2000). Following PreK, challenges exist when children enter kindergarten, as young EBLs are often placed in remedial education due to their lack of understanding of English (García et al., 2008). Further, at kindergarten entry, EBLs are

sometimes sequestered with other EBLs in SEI classrooms, going against much of the research on early language acquisition (Cook & Bornfreund, 2015).

While it is well documented that EBLs lag behind their monolingual English-speaking peers academically, there are many variables that account for this academic disparity, some of which relate to the institutional learning contexts and some to the broader social context. With regard to the former, García and Gonzales (2006) note that EBLs are more likely than their monolingual English speaking peers to attend low quality preschool programs with less-prepared teachers, less student diversity, fewer resources, higher teacher-to-child ratios, and larger class sizes. With regard to the latter, poverty, lack of subsidies, lack of transportation, parental language practices, access to resources and immigration status are societal factors that influence academic performance (Capps et al., 2005; Yoshikawa & Kholoptseva, 2013; Zambrana & Morant, 2009).

1.2.2 The policy challenge

The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), often referred to as the nation's educational report card, reveals that non-English language learner students in Massachusetts rank number one in the nation on grade four and eight reading and math, while EBL students trail far behind these rankings (Massachusetts Association of Teachers of Speakers of Other Languages [MATSOL], 2009). The test scores of EBLs are well below the state average, and in Boston alone, 54% of EBLs scored "warning/failing" on the 2017 MCAS test (Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education [DESE], 2017). According to MATSOL (2009), EBLs are the lowest performing subgroup in the state by every measure. In Massachusetts, EBLs were found to be more likely than English-proficient students to repeat a grade and were 25% more likely to be suspended (Owens, 2010). EBLs face the added challenge

of simultaneously learning content and academic English, which includes the complex and abstract language that allows students to participate in mainstream classrooms (Goldenberg, 2008). Failure to master academic English quickly spirals to falling behind one's classmates, earning poorer grades, getting discouraged and falling further behind, all of which culminates in EBLs having fewer career opportunities (Goldenberg, 2008). Evidently, the gap between the academic achievement of EBLs and all other students has increased since 2002, the year Question 2 passed (Massachusetts DESE, 2009; Massachusetts Language Opportunity Coalition, 2017; U.S. Department of Education, NAEP, 2015), indicating negative impacts of the Massachusetts English-only legislation for EBL children.

1.2.3 The challenges regarding teacher knowledge on working with young EBL children

Teachers face a number of challenges working with young EBLs in the classroom, which can often be traced to the widely held misconception that a child's use of his or her native language in the classroom inhibits both learning English as well as learning the material (Goldenberg et al., 2013). In fact, as the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) states (1995) the optimal development and learning of young children takes places when their native language and culture is respected, appreciated and encouraged in the classroom. Adding to the struggle of instructing young children who are still learning English are challenges regarding how to execute and adjust to instruction in the classroom—challenges which extend to and permeate every aspect of teaching including, but not limited to, the application of early learning and development standards.

Most early childhood teachers do not feel prepared to teach culturally and linguistically minoritized children (Daniel & Friedman, 2005; Hollins & Guzman, 2005). While early childhood teachers play an influential role in a student's life and are expected to meet each

child's unique needs (NAEYC, 2009, 1995), evidence from the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) has shown that in teaching EBLs, preschool teachers fall short in developing their students' academic language skills in English, higher-order thinking skills, and in providing high quality feedback to parents regarding their children's progress (Karoly & Gonzalez, 2011).

1.3 Rationale for this Study

1.3.1 Uniqueness of Boston, Massachusetts site

Massachusetts was one of the first states to have standards, and one of the first to recognize the importance of culturally and linguistically relevant standards. At the same time, as one of three states in the country to pass sweeping anti-bilingual education legislation, Massachusetts provided a unique context in which to conduct the research in this study. Furthermore, challenges to the bilingual education system in the state are compounded by the 2010 federal lawsuit brought against Boston public schools (BPS) for failing to adequately teach their EBL students (Mitchell, 2015; Vaznis, 2015). Specifically, the federal court ruled in 2010 that Boston public schools, as a district, violated Title VI by failing to conduct English language proficiency assessments for 7,000 EBL students who were assessed in only listening and speaking but not reading and writing. The court found the school district both failed to adequately support the language needs of EBL students who opted out of EBL services as well as failed to provide adequate staffing for EBL students (U.S. Department of Education, 2015). The city of Boston has given greater attention to improving the needs of EBL students, with BPS dedicating an additional $10 million in 2010 alone to bolster programs for EBLs as well as increasing preparation programs in SEI for teachers (Vaznis, 2010). Research is needed to discern if the increased awareness of the EBL plight in the city of Boston has compelled a similar greater awareness across the entire state of Massachusetts.

Further rationale for conducting this research specifically in Boston, Massachusetts is the city's strong and powerful early childhood education program that has served as an exemplary model nationally. Serving approximately 68% of the four-year-olds who are likely to enter kindergarten (Massachusetts DESE, 2016), the Boston Public PreK program is praised for the high quality developmentally appropriate and student-centered instruction, as well as the ongoing teacher education and on-site coaching and mentoring (Shaw, 2014). Research has corroborated the successes of the Boston Public PreK program: a 2013 study examined the impact of the PreK program on children's outcomes, finding that the program had a significant impact on children's language, literacy, numeracy, and mathematics skills, as well as impacts on children's executive functioning and emotion recognition (Weiland & Yoshikawa, 2013). Latinx children benefited more than non-Latinx children from the program as evidenced by their advances in their vocabulary, reading, and numeracy (Weiland & Yoshikawa, 2013). Despite evidence of these successes, huge gaps persist between the performance of emergent bilingual learners and their non-EBL counterparts, who continue to lag behind their peers in key areas of academic performance, and in graduation, college readiness, and standardized test performance (Massachusetts Language Opportunity Coalition, 2017).

The unique context of Boston's strong early childhood education program situated within the backdrop of Massachusetts' Question 2 legislation, and the state's substantial and growing population of EBLs, provided a potent tableau on which to better understand the relationship between language policy, early learning standards, and emergent bilingual learners. Better understanding this dynamic relationship will benefit both emergent bilingual learners, whose unique circumstances may be more likely to be addressed, as well as their preschool teachers, who may be better poised to address their EBL students' specific needs. From the Boston Public

Schools' experience, this study may inform the ways in which other cities in the state understand this language legislation and its implications for their EBL students. Beyond Massachusetts, this study may shed light onto the influence of shifting language policies in other states and their role in influencing the perceptions of ELDS for EBL students in the PreK classroom. Indeed, this study may elucidate the tensions between restrictive language policies passing in the context of supportive policies for early childhood education. Additionally, there may be insights gleaned from this situated study in understanding how ELDS are reportedly instantiated that can be carried over to other contexts nationwide as universal PreK continues to take shape.

1.3.2 Societal phenomenon compelling this study

This study is compelled by the glaring disproportionality in documented achievement between EBL students and their monolingual English-speaking peers that begins in early childhood and persists throughout high school (Espinosa, 2013; Figueras-Daniel & Barnett, 2013). There is a great deal of contention in the field of education as to how to best address this disproportionality. Another prominent rationale for this analysis is the growing population of EBL students in the United States (Kieffer et al., 2009). Across the United States, 27% of children of immigrants ages five through eight are EBLs, with five-year-olds in preschool claiming the highest percentage (37%) (Baird, 2015; Fortuny et al., 2010). In Boston alone, roughly 30% of the city's 57,000 public school students are EBLs (Vaznis, 2015). More than four million EBLs are enrolled in ECE programs across the United States, and make up 30% of the population enrolled in Head Start and Early Head Start programs (Goldenberg et al., 2013). Massachusetts itself has approximately 81,146 EBLs enrolled in public schools, comprising 8.5% of the total student population (Solórzano, 2015). With increasing numbers of EBLs, it is

especially critical that their educational needs are addressed early and addressed in a manner that best suits them.

Finally, the existence of ELDS across all states, and the wide reach of these standards in all PreK classrooms, justifies closer study of their perceived utility. Given that ELDS are designed to improve teaching and learning, it is important to understand how preschool teachers and policy personnel themselves understand these standards. Moreover, it is critical to understand how teachers integrate ELDS with their practice generally, and specifically with regard to their EBL students. Kagan and Scott-Little (2004) state that "standards are a true litmus test of the future direction of the field" (p. 395), signaling how an examination of early learning and development standards, and education stakeholders' subjective sense of these standards, can offer insight into the direction of ECE at the policy level and in classroom practice.

1.3.3 Benefits of PreK as impetus for strengthening PreK for EBLs

1.3.3.1 Benefits of PreK on child development for all children

Further rationale behind the focus of this research is the profound impact high quality PreK can have on all children's development. Children who attend preschool in the year prior to enrolling in kindergarten have an advantage in reading and math skills over their peers who did not attend center-based care (Goldenberg et al., 2013; Magnuson et al., 2006). Specifically, preschool settings hold potential for advancing school readiness and mitigating the disproportionality between advantaged and disadvantaged groups of children (Karoly & Gonzalez, 2011). The High/Scope Perry Preschool Program, an influential early childhood intervention that tracked participants over nearly forty years, found that high quality early childhood education provides low-income, minority students significant positive academic and social benefits over the course of a lifetime. Participants had higher academic achievement,

completed more years of schooling, were less likely to need special education programs, reported higher monthly earnings as an adult, and averaged fewer arrests (Schweinhart, 2003). The Chicago Child-Parent Centers (CPC), a longitudinal study of the effects of early childhood intervention and education for low-income children from minoritized backgrounds, also reported long-term benefits from PreK participation (Reynolds et al., 2002). A 2015 study in Miami found that low-income children who attended the publicly-funded PreK program or a subsidized center-based program at age four scored above national averages in pre-academic and social behavioral skills upon kindergarten entry (Ansari & López, 2015).

1.3.3.2 Benefits of PreK specifically for EBLs

Young EBL children are well-positioned to benefit from high quality PreK programs designed to address their needs, especially given that—for many EBLs—English language proficiency at kindergarten entry is often a significant contributing factor to depressed academic achievement (Galindo, 2010). For some non-monolingual English-speaking children, ECE programs may provide the first opportunity to learn academic English (Figueras-Daniel & Barnett, 2013). In New Jersey's state-funded Abbott Preschool Program, children—the majority of whom were Latinx and EBLs—showed significant gains in their achievement (Laosa & Ainsworth, 2007). Waldfogel (2012) finds that increasing center-based preschool attendance for young Latinx children in particular could help close the Latinx-white achievement gap by 26%. A 2008 study at Georgetown University found that Latinx children who participated in Oklahoma's ECE programs showed substantial improvements in pre-reading, pre-writing, and pre-math skills, significantly outpacing non-Latinx children (Gormley, 2008). Additionally, the introduction to formal schooling for EBL students in the early childhood classroom helps them adapt to differing sociocultural environments, learning the norms of the classroom setting,

playing with peers, and developing relationships with other adults (Karoly & Gonzalez, 2011; Magruder et al., 2013).

1.3.3.3 Societal benefits of PreK for all children

As the early stages of cognitive development are critical for ensuring success throughout one's lifetime, ECE represents a significantly more efficient form of educational intervention than later corrective programs aimed at under-performing secondary students (Anderson, 2014; Belfield et al., 2006; Carneiro & Ginja, 2014; Heckman et al., 2010; Reynolds et al., 2001). Heckman (2006) writes that while remedial education programs entail, "a serious trade-off between equity and efficiency for adolescent and young adult skill policies… there is no such tradeoff for policies targeted toward disadvantaged young children" (p. 7). An economic analysis of preschool education spending shows that the rate of return, in terms of skill attainment, decreases substantially over the course of a lifetime (Heckman & Masterov, 2007). In a political climate dominated by calls for smaller government and increased fiscal responsibility, ECE for young children represents a highly efficient use of public funds (Heckman, 2006; Heckman & Masterov, 2007; Muschkin et al., 2015; Reynolds et al., 2001; Rolnick & Grunewald, 2003; Schweinhart et al., 2005). Additionally, investments in early childhood education are also linked to reduced involvement in the criminal justice system, benefiting society at large (Heckman et al., 2010; Reynolds et al., 2001).

1.4 Significance of this Study

The significance of this study is that it seeks to contribute to the research on the relationship between ELDS and EBLs' learning experiences. By understanding the relationship between ELDS in early childhood and the needs of young EBLs, there is greater potential to maximize the uses and benefits of ELDS for students who are learning English alongside another

language. This study also has the potential to influence policy in a number of ways. Research highlighting teachers' perceptions of standards within a variety of different public preschool program models (general education, SEI, dual language) for EBL students has the potential to influence legislation and policy formation regarding EBLs. In addition, more precise and current data on teacher and policy perspectives of ELDS and their relationship to EBL students may inform policy on teacher education, including addressing teacher preparation for standards implementation. Scott-Little, Kagan, and Frelow (2005) maintain that it is critical to understand how ELDS are utilized in the field and how they are impacting practice. Given the amount of time, resources, and energy needed to develop, revise, and implement standards at the state and district level, understanding and maximizing their utility for all children should be central to ongoing policy discussions.

1.5 Positionality

Evident throughout this study is my personal bias in favor of a sociocultural theoretical framework and my critical stance on ELDS. With regard to the sociocultural framework, my educational opportunities—from the professors I have learned from to the other students I have worked with—have predisposed me to value a sociocultural framework that sees the inherent value in promoting dual language education. I witnessed firsthand the benefits of dual language learning that leveraged native language skills and cultural knowledge when I assisted a Teachers College professor in a dual language elementary school classroom in 2015. It is clear throughout this paper that my bias is strongly in favor of this sociocultural theory of learning.

Also evidenced in this paper is my critical stance towards standards and their implementation. Though I strongly value standards and their purpose in the field of early childhood education, I find them sometimes flawed in their design and implementation, and

occasionally inhibiting the sociocultural framework. My positionality in favor of a sociocultural theoretical framework and critical stance on ELDS transcends the framing, data collection, and analysis of this study. In spite of my position, I do not see my stance as necessarily diametrically opposed to ELDS, and I worked diligently to present all perspectives from my participants and to reconcile my sociocultural view and ELDS.

My sociocultural orientation was framed by my own educational experiences growing up in a privileged Boston suburb and attending schools that were mostly white and where students were predominantly monolingual English speakers. I sought out opportunities to learn about and experience other languages and cultures, studying both Italian and Spanish in high school, majoring in Spanish and Religion in college, and later becoming a high school Spanish teacher, where, in addition to my teaching responsibilities, I led a variety of domestic and international service learning and experiential-oriented trips with students in order to expand their worldviews.

My interest in working to support marginalized students in education led me to a Master's degree in international educational development and my current program in early childhood education policy at Teachers College, where, in addition to my studies, I was a supervisor for Master's degree students in early childhood education, focusing on bilingual education. These experiences collectively contribute to a lens which values bilingualism, and frames the present research. I believe it is a critical—indeed a moral imperative—to ensure that young EBL children have access to quality early education and care that will promote their healthy development, wellbeing, and school readiness.

Chapter II – REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This literature review explores the existing research in the areas of early learning and development standards, early childhood education for EBL students, as well as the historical, theoretical and sociopolitical context surrounding EBLs. The chapter begins with an exploration into the sociocultural theory of learning in young children, drawing upon the theories of Vygotsky and Rogoff to better understand child learning. The second section looks at early learning and development standards and their role in early childhood education, highlighting both their benefits and limitations as well as exploring their relationship to EBL students and teachers of EBL students. The second section also explores cultural variation and standards. The third section reviews definitions for the terms EBL—emergent bilingual learner, DLL—dual language learner, and ELL—English language learner, and provides an overview of the history of EBLs in the United States and in Massachusetts. The fourth and fifth sections review the historical and sociopolitical framework for bilingual education, providing context to understand the present status of EBLs and bilingual education in American schools as well as highlighting current research and theories behind both dual language learning and English-only instruction. To provide further context, this section includes information on the current English-only legislation, known as Question 2, passed in Massachusetts in 2002. Finally, the sixth section explores teacher education and attitudes regarding linguistic and cultural diversity in the early childhood classroom, as well as literature on standards education for early childhood teachers.

2.1 Sociocultural Theories of Learning in Young Children: Vygotsky and Rogoff

Sociocultural theories of learning help explicate the ways in which children acquire knowledge and make meaning of their worlds through their cultural contexts. Sociocultural theory posits that human learning is a social process; it emphasizes the interactions between

people and their culture as playing a pivotal role in learning (Berk & Winsler, 1995). Adopting a sociocultural lens provides both culturally and linguistically relevant theories regarding EBLs. The research highlights two sociocultural theorists—Vygotsky and Rogoff—whose work examines child development and language acquisition, essential for understanding EBLs' learning trajectories. Both provide theories on child learning that can assist in forming a more holistic understanding of the relationship between EBLs, ELDS, and language policy through a working framework that integrates the many dimensions of a child's learning.

2.1.1 Vygotsky

The study looks to the work of famed social scientist Lev Vygotsky to understand the ways in which a child's learning occurs. Vygotsky, in his identification of scaffolding and the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), presents a culturally and linguistically relevant method of understanding child cognitive development. According to Vygotsky, when educators build upon the pre-existing infrastructure of knowledge that a child has acquired (scaffolding), learning takes place in a social process as part of a child's ZPD. This research uses Vygotsky's sociocultural theory of learning to better understand the ways in which teachers scaffold within an EBL child's ZPD as well as how ELDS play a role in assisting this scaffolding. The study also uses Vygotsky's sociocultural theory in analyzing written ELDS documents to understand the extent to which EBL children's learning and development must be understood within their greater sociohistorical context.

Vygotsky sought to unearth the ingredients that create the optimal learning environment for children, contributing prolific research to the literature on children's cognitive development. In his pivotal work on social learning theory, Vygotsky created a theory of development based on four basic principles: that children construct knowledge, that development cannot be

separated from its social context, that learning can lead to development, and that language plays a central role in mental development (Bodrova & Leong, 2007). Vygotsky's theory places the symbolically and materially rich interactions between children and their social and cultural environment at its core (Moll, 2013).

As the field of sociocultural theory is largely attributed to his trailblazing research, Vygotsky, through his understanding of child development and particularly language and learning acquisition, is referenced throughout this study. Through understanding Vygotsky's theory of scaffolding, which views child development as a social process where teachers and caregivers build upon the pre-existing infrastructure of knowledge that a child has acquired, it is possible to identify approaches for culturally and linguistically appropriate teaching. This research is framed by Vygotsky's particular value placed on a child's native language and self-identity as providing the springboard from which cognitive and developmental advances occur (Vygotsky, 1978). Vygotsky emphasized the importance of focusing on children's strengths and abilities rather than their weaknesses or deficits (Berk & Winsler, 1995).

Vygotsky viewed language as the essential method of communication, personal reflection, thought development, and cultural transmission (Noormohamadi, 2008). Vygotsky emphasized that as a child's language skills develop, his or her cognitive processes also develop, enabling language to be used in more abstract ways. The link between language and development is critical; "if the relationship between language and cognitive development operates as Vygotsky and later theorists claim, educational practices that ignore or negatively regard a student's native language and culture could have negative effects on the student's cognitive development" (García, 2004, p. 254). Indeed, Vygotsky conceptualized "talking to

learn,"—the idea that a child's verbal interactions with others lead to higher order thinking skills (Vygotsky, 1978).

2.1.1.1 The nature of the zone of proximal development

The Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), representing a continuum of a child's abilities, is the distance between what a child is capable of achieving alone and what a child is capable of achieving with adult guidance and assistance. Specifically, the ZPD emphasizes the role of culture and language where language development occurs through informal and formal classroom dialogue (Moll, 2013). The ZPD is designed to support ongoing analysis in the classroom, allowing change to take place through culturally mediated processes (Moll, 2013). The zone provides a space for "emergent" understandings of student processes and outcomes, as these are not predetermined, but emerge from the social relations within the zone (Moll, 2013, p. 78). A Vygotskian lens of the ZPD stipulates that young children's mental schemata develop within a sociocultural framework, imbuing a child with the ability to access his or her unique cultural and linguistic repertoire. The ZPD reframed the ways in which educators view verbal interactions and learning acquisition—recognizing the importance of language in social interactions and using language patterns to scaffold a child's learning (Isik-Ercan & Golbeck, 2010).

The ZPD is particularly useful in understanding the experience of the EBL student for whom language acquisition comprises a complex trajectory. Referencing the ZPD in understanding both a child's particular language development as well as their individual cultural capital is essential for deconstructing the experience of the EBL student and understanding how to support them as they arrive at new knowledge. The ZPD comprises both scientific, or "visible," and spontaneous, or "invisible," mediations that guide educators to support children in

their learning. Specifically, invisible mediations—subtly hidden in sociocultural experiences—are where a teacher draws upon a child's home language, culture and knowledge. This is especially relevant for EBL students, for whom native language and culture influences cognitive and social development.

2.1.1.2 Scaffolding and the Zone of Proximal Development

The ZPD was envisioned as a way to assist educators in scaffolding a child's learning through proactive support (Fleer et al., 2009). Scaffolding, as envisioned by Vygotsky, is the emotionally and culturally supportive method by which social learning occurs. Central to Vygotsky's theory of scaffolding is the cultural mediation of thinking whereby individuals' rich language and culture, described by Vygotsky as symbols and tools, informs and advances cognitive development (Moll, 2013). In this model, teachers provide mental and emotional support to a child as his or her learning as knowledge is acquired. The process of scaffolding, Vygotsky believed, helps to actualize the ZPD. The interactions that occur within the ZPD—using cultural tools that are adapted to the activity—enable children to participate in activities that they are unable to do alone (Rogoff, 2003). According to the National Center on Quality Teaching and Learning, teachers scaffold children's learning by providing hints when children struggle, offering a range of answers when children need extra support, and encouraging children to access additional resources to support their understanding of a concept. Through scaffolding, educators provide temporary supports to their students, which are gradually withdrawn as the child masters the skill (Lee, 2011).

Vygotsky sees scaffolding occurring in the ZPD in five steps: joint problem solving, intersubjectivity, warmth and responsiveness, keeping the child in the ZPD, and promoting self-regulation (Berk & Winsler, 1995). Language plays a critical role in scaffolding strategies for

children, as language is a tool to self-regulate during activities (Berk & Winsler, 1995). Vygotsky (1978) understands language learning as part of the sociocultural context in which it occurs, and through his sociocultural model identifies a fluid and responsive teaching model that greatly benefits the EBL child.

2.1.1.3 Standardized assessments and the Zone of Proximal Development

Vygotsky's theoretical approach of the ZPD advances a child's learning through engagement in a variety of processes, including the interactions between children and adults, a child's engagement in the classroom, and the responsiveness of the learning atmosphere (Landers, 2011; Mowder et al., 2009). In the ECE classroom, contextual factors can be hard to measure and regulate (Kagan, 2008; Penn, 2011). Vygotsky believed that process variables more accurately reflect a child's learning and cognitive development than standardized tests and the static measurements of students' capabilities (Moll, 2013). In fact, Vygotsky developed the ZPD as a response to the flaws in standardized testing, claiming they "confused latent capacities with developed abilities" (Lidz & Gindis, 2003, p. 102). Other educators agree, finding standards difficult to discern actual abilities from proximal abilities, especially in EBLs (Bowman et al., 2001).

Vygotsky advocated for formative assessment through an approach he referred to as dynamic assessment that, based on the concept of the ZPD, interweaves testing with instruction in a more formative assessment model (Lidz & Gindis, 2003). Through formative assessment, teachers combine teaching and assessing in order to discover what the student already knows. In this way, the teacher is able to establish what a student already knows, teach material that the student has not yet mastered, and then evaluate their learning by informally retesting on the information just received (Bouchillon, n.d.).

2.1.2 Rogoff

Equally germane to this analysis as Vygotsky, Barbara Rogoff's theory of the cultural nature of human development emphasizes how individuals develop within their cultural communities, treating culture as dynamic and evolving (Rogoff, 2007). Her theory falls within a sociocultural approach, since this approach examines the social, historical, institutional and cultural factors in a child's life, which has particular relevance for the EBL experience where language acquisition is culturally and historically influenced (Bodrova & Leong, 2007; Fleer et al., 2009). Rogoff (2003) sees culture as evolving and "formed from the efforts of people working together, using and adapting material and symbolic tools provided by predecessors and in the process creating new ones" (p. 51). In this way, Rogoff (2003) understands culture and cultural tools as both inherited from previous generations and constantly evolving by present and future generations. Rogoff's emphasis on culture is used in this study to understand child learning within its cultural context, providing a lens through which to analyze ELDS documents and understand teachers' and policy experts' perceptions of the utility of standards for EBLs. Through the lens of Rogoff's sociocultural approach, a child's world becomes a valued and respected reality that is conducive to cognitive growth and development.

Rogoff (1990) furthers Vygotsky's notion of the ZPD by introducing the idea of guided participation in cultural activities as an apprenticeship in thinking, where skills become improved through interactions with more skilled adults. A child's guided participation involves collaborating with caregivers and peers to build bridges from his or her present understanding to reach new skills (Rogoff, 1990). Rogoff (1990) suggests that guidance and participation in culturally important activities are critical for children's learning and development, and must be tailored for each particular child. These interactions occur in informal settings of everyday life,

in addition to formal settings where the ZPD takes place. Rogoff believes that children benefit cognitively from routine daily activities in and out of the classroom, and uses culture as an overarching umbrella to understand socialization and development.

However, Rogoff and Vygotsky differ in their views of language as a tool through which to communicate in the ZPD or through guided participation. While Vygotsky emphasized formal and "didactic dialogue" through school, Rogoff emphasizes informal and implicit means of communication for young children in their everyday lives, in both formal and informal settings (Rogoff, 1990, p. 16). Further, while Vygotsky emphasized language as the most critical tool for learning and development, Rogoff (1990) views communication more broadly as encompassing verbal and nonverbal dialogue that isn't necessarily specific to a didactic schooling approach, and thus encompasses more cultural innuendos and cues. Rogoff (1990) emphasizes "shared activity with communication that includes words as well as actions" (p. 17). Rogoff's theory, which views language learning as embedded in a familiar context, is directly relevant to the EBL child's experience of language learning and knowledge acquisition as it addresses the importance of individualizing culturally relevant learning for each child (Garton, 2007).

Rogoff's approach is also used to understand the extent to which policy is built upon the practices of the cultural community of the majority. Rogoff seeks to place childrearing in its cultural context, and is critical of using Eurocentric benchmarks of a child's rate of development. Rogoff (2007) writes that "the rush to teach babies in utero and toddlers in academic preschools is based on a cultural metaphor for development—a racetrack—that is based on the institutions and practices of the cultural community of the majority of researchers publishing in psychology" (p. 5). Rogoff (1990) argues that, while traditional skills in cognitive development, such as literacy, mathematics, and science, are valuable goals, "progress must be defined" by local

standards and goals that reflect a diversity of backgrounds and cultures (p. 12). While not explicitly advocating for standards, Rogoff acknowledges the need to define developmental benchmarks that take local culture into account, an important contribution to the study of standards.

Both Vygotsky and Rogoff share a sociocultural perspective of learning that places supreme value on individual cultural and linguistic context in understanding learning acquisition and development. These theorists have been chosen for this analysis because their theories on child learning and development complement one another and assist in forming a more holistic understanding of the relationship between EBLs and ELDS. Rogoff and Vygotsky together help to contextualize the EBL experience in early childhood as they highlight the ways in which language, culture—along with the broader educational policy which encompasses them—influence child learning in preschool settings. Each theorist provides a unique approach necessary to better understand child learning and development; together, the theories comprise a framework for conceptualizing and integrating the many dimensions of a child's learning, with particular relevance to the EBL experience.

2.2 Standards in Early Childhood Education

2.2.1 Historical overview of standards in early childhood education

The standards movement, initiated to improve academic achievement through stronger school-based accountability, is a structural element of education reform that has pervaded the K-12 education system and taken hold in the early childhood sphere (Scott-Little et al., 2007). Early learning and development standards are increasingly seen as a powerful method for improving preschool instruction and children's school readiness (Drew et al., 2008).

The initial idea of the standards-based reform movement began during the Cold War, when strained U.S.-Russian relations created a space race, and thus economic race, to be the world's superpower. After Russia launched Sputnik in 1957, the first Earth satellite, the United States responded with the 1958 National Defense Education Act, an early iteration of standards, that sought to improve foreign languages and science and math instruction in schools as a way to bolster the nation's competitive edge (Slavin, 1990). Standards were seen as a way to benchmark student learning with the goal of ensuring an academically advanced society in order to compete with the Russians. The intrinsic value of the individual was echoed in the standards-based reform movement, which sought to ensure the academic success of all students. The Civil Rights movement, by championing the rights of each and every individual regardless of race, ethnicity or national origin, created an atmosphere that promoted the value of every individual and his or her right to succeed.

Efforts to redress low academic performance hallmarked the national education agenda of the 1980s and 1990s. The 1983 publication of "A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform" called for the U.S. to adopt more rigorous and measurable standards and higher expectations for academic performance. Subsequently, the National Education Goals Panel established six goals for children's academic performance in 1989, paving the way for the introduction of education standards. The first goal outlined was the "readiness" goal that called for all children to begin school ready to learn, a significant and unprecedented acknowledgment of the importance of early childhood education (Kagan & Hallmark, 2002). The National Education Goals Panel also defined five dimensions of children's early learning and development—important because it set the groundwork for the development of statewide early learning and development standards as well as the developmental domains that they address.

These domains are: physical well-being and motor development; social and emotional development; approaches toward learning; language development; and cognition and general knowledge (Kagan et al., 1995).

Standards further took shape in early childhood education in the 1994 *Goals 2000: Educate America Act*, championed by President Clinton that included a call for the development of preschool early learning and development standards in response to the first of the eight national educational goals (the goals were revised from six to eight by Congress in 1994) (National Research Council, 1997; Schwartz & Robinson, 2000). Standards were advanced at the preschool level a few years later, in the 1998 reauthorization of Head Start, the country's largest federally funded early childhood program for low-income children. That year, Congress required Head Start to collect data on children's language and literacy development through the Head Start Child Outcomes Framework, one of the first comprehensive frameworks for early childhood education standards[1] (Kagan et al., 2003).

Expanding on the outcomes of the Goals 2000 framework and the Head Start Child Outcomes Framework, the federal early childhood initiative *Good Start, Grow Smart* was established in 2002. As part of this initiative, states were required to develop guidelines on early literacy and early mathematics concepts for children ages three to five that aligned with state K-

[1] Head Start's child development and learning outcomes standards have gone through several iterations—the first set of standards released in 2000 as the Head Start Child Outcomes Framework, the second set released in 2010 as the Head Start Child Development and Early Learning Framework, and the third set released in 2015 as the Head Start Early Learning Outcomes Framework. Head Start's child development and learning outcomes standards are intended to support programs in their curriculum planning and ongoing assessment of children so that they can be school ready, and guide practitioners on what children should know and be able to do in early childhood. The Head Start standards emphasize children's academic and developmental learning goals, including standards for approaches to learning, social and emotional development, language and communication, literacy, mathematics development, scientific reasoning, and perceptual, motor, and physical development. The Head Start standards document provides an overview of EBLs in the introductory material within the guide.

12 standards, with most states going further in subsequent revisions and addressing other domains of development, such as social-emotional development and physical development (Child Care Bureau, Administration for Children and Families, n.d.).

The development and use of ELDS has been propelled by research on children's learning and development, the push for high quality ECE programming, and the push to improve child outcomes in ECE programs both nationally and abroad (Scott-Little et al., 2007). Now every state has early childhood standards for preschool-age children and most have standards for infants and toddlers. There is also a movement to better align preschool standards with kindergarten standards, in what is known as P-3 or P-16 (National Institute for Early Education Research [NIEER], 2014; Takanishi & Kauerz, 2008). Under the Obama administration, early learning and development standards became more ubiquitous in the preschool classroom as the *Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge* (2011) federally funded grant competition encouraged school readiness as a state policy goal to reduce achievement gaps. Among the school readiness goals was a requirement to have comprehensive ELDS.

2.2.2 Benefits of standards in the early childhood classroom environment

Many academics agree that standards present an opportunity to bridge the country's education gaps as well as guide the development of teacher qualifications, curriculum, and evaluation. As global and national demands have shifted, standards have further evolved to account for creative thinking, advanced cognitive processing, and equity and quality in education. In theory, standards have the ability to "level the playing field and promote equity" (Kagan, 2012, p. 58). Indeed, Bowman (2006) believes that "standards are at the heart of educational equity" in early childhood education (p. 42). These developments have inspired optimism among a large number of academics and policy makers.

Standards documents can serve as resources for both policymakers and practitioners who work with young children (Scott-Little et al., 2009). Scott-Little et al. (2003) argue that the benefits of standards do exist but are conditioned upon many variables. As Kagan (2012) insists, standards must be "consensually developed and scientifically validated" and can be used to support parent education, inform the public, develop age and content appropriate curriculum, monitor children's progress, and evaluate programs (p. 65). Kagan (2012) writes: "standards can serve as the pivot around which early childhood pedagogy—in all its related forms—rotates" (p. 65). This type of integrated approach to early childhood places children at the center of policy reform and has been adopted around the globe with country-specific policies. Kagan (2012) emphasizes that ELDS can serve as an intellectual core for an integrated and holistic approach to early learning, serving multiple applications. A Learning Policy Institute report (2016) listed comprehensive early learning and development standards in PreK programs as the first most essential ingredient for policymakers wishing to create high quality preschool programs (Mongeau, 2016; Wechsler et al., 2016).

With many advocating the use of ELDS, it is important to underscore their potential uses. Designed as positive and beneficial tools for teaching and learning, they can serve as a resource for educators to access and understand a learning continuum for all young children, framed by a set of expectations for what children should know and be able to do at specific age/developmental stages. A clear framework of standards for early learning and development can help "promote continuity for children across early opportunities, and promote consistency in selecting and measuring the child outcomes to be achieved across all programs in the state" (Slentz et al., 2008, p. 6). In so doing, standards can encourage consistency across all programs through their expectations of children's learning and development.

Moreover, ELDS can provide valuable information on children. Early research of Scott-Little and colleagues (2003), and with Reid (2009), affirms that early learning guidelines can direct educators to creating more intentional and appropriate teaching practices. As standards documents can develop a common understanding of what all children need to thrive, teachers are able to create more cohesive and unified lesson plans (Neuman & Roskos, 2005). Continued efforts to improve early learning and development standards documents can also lead to teacher education and more fluid and cohesive services (Neuman & Roskos, 2005).

Standards can also impact curriculum. Early learning and development standards can "provide a consistent point of departure for curriculum development, instruction, and assessment" (Slentz et al., 2008, p. 6). Well-defined and research-based ELDS can help organize curriculum and instruction, subsequently supporting children's school readiness (NAEYC & NAECS/SDE, 2002; Rendon et al., 2014). Potentially, a viable standards-aligned curriculum can lead to a more organized classroom and a more productive teaching environment.

Finally, standards have the potential to promote continuity for children across early childhood education programs and through the elementary school years. Specifically, carefully crafted PreK ELDS should be linked to expectations in K-12, leading to a coherent approach to children's long-term educational continuum and fluid vertical transitions from PreK through Kindergarten and the early grades of primary school (NAEYC & NAECS/SDE, 2002). The National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC)—the leading voice on the education of young children—released a 2002 position statement asserting that early learning and development standards play an integral role in a child's long-term educational success. Indeed, standards that detail expectations for children's learning lead to their successful performance in school later on (Scott-Little et al., 2003).

2.2.3 Limitations of standards in the early childhood classroom environment

As beneficial as standards appear to be, they are also laden with limitations. Standards can decrease the role of local input in early childhood education. Early childhood has traditionally been viewed as an intimate, private service where families can choose among diverse service options. Developing a set of uniform standards that could be used across states is both hard to implement and could undermine local educational autonomy (Scott-Little et al., 2005) and the diversity of options available to parents. They homogenize options.

Another limitation of ELDS is their sometimes overly prescriptive nature. Bodrova and Leong (2005) caution that domains of ELDS should not be over specified for fear of enforcing narrow instruction, but rather they should provide a balanced approach to children's learning that serves as a general guideline for instruction. While they can be overly prescriptive, Scott-Little and colleagues (2005) question the implications of standards as the basis of teaching and learning, particularly when standards lack important areas for learning, potentially leading to misguided instructional practices.

Addressing culture and diversity within standards presents a unique challenge. The intrinsic uniformity of standards often precludes accounting for linguistic and cultural diversity (Espinosa & Calderón, 2015; Wright et al., 2007). Some educators and scholars believe that including cultural differences within formal standards documents complicates the development of generalized statements about children's learning (Rogoff, 2003). This ties into the tension between asset-based pedagogies and standards, as standards impose standardized expectations, and do not necessarily consider the individual assets that children bring. Many scholars, however, argue that culture and diversity must be addressed within standards at the risk of marginalizing minoritized students (Rogoff, 2003; Souto-Manning & Martell, 2016). Bowman

(2006) believes that there is no such thing as developmental competence outside of a cultural context, particularly given today's diverse classroom makeup. Likewise, NAEYC recognizes these limitations of ELDS and cautions that they are only beneficial if they emphasize developmentally and culturally appropriate content and outcomes, if they utilize expert knowledge, and are integrated with families (NAEYC & NAECS/SDE, 2002). Wright, Copeman, and Bruner (2007) believe it is critically important for ELDS to offer specific examples and applications of the standards for the many cultural groups in a way that more aptly represents the racial and cultural diversity of young children in the U.S. and globally, as this will assist early childhood educators engage in more responsive ways of teaching, which view emergent bilingual children as being "at promise" rather than "at risk" (Swadener & Lubeck, 1995).

Furthermore, standards can alter pedagogy. In addition to the difficulty in implementing standards in diverse early childhood settings, some caution that such standards may promulgate a teacher-centered approach over the more traditionally accepted and age-appropriate child-centered approach (Scott-Little et al., 2003). Many educators believe that standards can impose constraints and limit expansive thinking (Bowman, 2006; Espinosa, 2007; Hatch, 2002; Wright et al., 2007). Some observers are cautious and find limited utility in the current application of standards, and very few discredit the implementation of standards in early childhood entirely. Moreover, when teachers use state-specific standards, they are not necessarily given the preparation necessary to incorporate instruction tailored to students for whom English is not a primary language (Daniel & Friedman, 2005; Ray & Bowman, 2003).This lack of preparation is among the many obstacles presented by the implementation of standards.

One of the most widespread criticisms of standards is related to their evocation of often-inappropriate assessment. Inherently, standards, because of their precision, and their Eurocentrism, can accelerate and place undue pressure on assessment (Souto-Manning & Rabadi-Raol, 2018). In part, an aversion to assessments prevails in the early childhood community because of standards' failure to acknowledge children's individuality and their individual learning styles and rates. But the problem is deeper than that because often preschool teachers utilize assessments that are not aligned with ELDS, resulting in a lack of integration of the standards in their curriculum, planning, and assessments (Grisham-Brown et al., 2006). Hatch (2002) worries that the early childhood teaching profession is becoming technical in areas of assessment and curriculum development, since teachers are obliged to increasingly "monitor children's progress through a hierarchy of prescribed outcomes" (p. 460). Such assessment requires teachers to understand standards and their application, yet complicating the situation, many teachers lack the material and support to align instruction with state standards, particularly for EBLs (García et al., 2008). Indeed, Kagan (2012) finds the greatest concern about standards is how teachers, administrators, and schools misuse them.

2.2.4 Limitations of standards for diversity and EBLs

ELDS can sometimes have the unfortunate side-effect of enforcing a one-sided framework for how children should learn, disregarding the many developmentally appropriate ways that children can arrive at an understanding of a concept, and promoting an "either/or" perspective about developmentally appropriate teaching practices (Bowman, 2006). Standards align with U.S. dominant cultural practices, milestones, and timelines, which may preclude those for immigrant children (Delpit, 2012; Genishi & Dyson, 2012). For some scholars, like Hatch (2002), there are inherent limitations to common standards that negatively impact minoritized

students. By ignoring individual differences, he argues, standards limit the ability to develop talent, and risk jeopardizing the learning opportunities among those who need it most. As he poignantly states, "in a model driven by an obsession with sameness, diversity becomes a problem, and children from diverse groups are likely to become casualties simply because of their differences" (Hatch, 2002, p. 461). Reid and colleagues (2016) caution that ELDS can potentially negatively impact minoritized students: "far less attention has been accorded to how the ELDS themselves represent cultural expectations and perhaps latent biases, which could render the standards irrelevant, or even harmful, when used in classrooms increasingly characterized by extraordinary cultural diversity" (p. 3).

Many linguistically minoritized children are unfairly tracked and labeled learning disabled due to their inability to adhere to monolithic standards (National Center for Culturally Responsive Educational Systems, 2004), a potential consequence of encouraging a one-dimensional framework for how children learn. The 2002 joint position statement of NAEYC and NAECS/SDE specifically noted that young culturally and linguistically minoritized children could be negatively labeled, retained in grade, or denied educational services due to ELDS. Non-monolingual English speaking students have specific needs regarding meeting early language and literacy requirements that should be addressed. Yet, as of now, states handle standards for EBLs in different ways, often only mentioning EBLs in the introductions or appendices to standards documents. Scholars such as Adelson et al. (2014), Espinosa (2007), and García et al. (2008), have put forward various suggestions for how to address the specific needs of EBLs. García and colleagues (2008) argue that EBL students require additional support in the alignment of instruction with standards. Espinosa (2007) has emphasized the need to differentiate between a child's developmental challenges and their linguistic differences, which requires educators to

understand how to apply standards to minoritized learners and meet each child's unique needs. This is particularly true for young EBL children, for whom linguistic ability is often misconstrued as a developmental delay, and conversely, a developmental delay can often be misconstrued as a language barrier (Adelson et al., 2014). While states do intend to address the needs of EBL students, few offer specific guidance on how to effectively use standards for EBLs, instead only gesturing to the importance of the value of culture in the introductions to standards documents (Castro et al., 2011; Kagan et al., 2013; Wright et al., 2007).

2.2.5 Cultural variation and standards

Underlying the exploration into the nexus between standards and EBLs is the critically important discussion on universal child developmental milestones, and in particular, identifying the place of cultural variation among children. Distinguishing variation and standardization is paramount to discerning the extent to which ELDS meet the needs of EBL students. It is important to understand how cultural variation influences development; according to Bruner (2007), there are universal development milestones that all children, regardless of their language or culture, learn in the PreK classroom, yet within these universals are significant variations in cultural practices that should be recognized and, as much as possible, incorporated into ELDS.

A failure to discern cultural variation from universal milestones can lead to bias in the development of ELDS, particularly given that individuals from a dominant community are generally those in the position of establishing standards (Rogoff, 2003). Rogoff (2003) finds that the individuals who establish standards assume their own developmental trajectories to be the norm, to the exclusion of those held by non-dominant, ethnically and linguistically minoritized people. Standards, therefore, may represent an incomplete or inaccurate picture of developmental milestones. However the question remains to what degree various methods of standardization

can account for inherent cultural and developmental variation among children. Indeed, Reid and colleagues (2017) question: “How can systemic ‘standardized’ approaches to ECE quality in the U.S., where early learning and development standards are ubiquitous, be reconciled with the nuances of local context and individual variation” (p. 10)? With these issues in mind, the following section uses the five domains of school readiness to illustrate variations in cultural practices as they often appear in the context of ELDS. These domains are physical development and motor skills; social and emotional development; approaches to learning; language and communication development; and cognitive development and general knowledge.

2.2.5.1 Cultural variation in physical development

Childrearing practices vary within and across cultures, equally influencing children’s motor development. In the United States, child physical development has long been described and understood according to normative growth patterns. Yet within child development guidelines, there is little mention of cultural practices and norms, which research shows has a significant role in influencing a child's growth and development (Rogoff, 2003). Adolph and Berger (2015) likewise believe that children’s physical and motor development is “enculturated,” that is, existing within a social and historical context that is influenced by the caregiver’s expectations and parenting practices (p. 262). Childrearing practices profoundly influence which motor skills children acquire and when and through what sequence they are acquired (Adolph & Robinson, 2015). For example, many caregivers in parts of Africa, the Caribbean, and India repeatedly extend and flex infants’ arms and legs, suspend the body by the head or one limb, and encourage infants to hold their head up and support their body weight (Adolph & Robinson, 2015). Infants who receive these motor development exercises sit, stand, and step earlier than infants who do not. In the United States, mothers are taught that newborns are fragile and their

head must always be supported, while elsewhere mothers are taught that infants must be trained to resist gravity; these variations influence rates of motor development (Adolph & Robinson, 2015).

While some early research indicated an awareness of variation in physical development—such as Trettien's 1900 work that found children's long dresses hampered their movements—the bulk of research neglected to address cultural variation in child development patterns. For example, Gesell's early works (1925) insisted that infants developed their motor skills according to a linear, normative sequence. Only years later did his research (Gesell, 1946) begin to account for discrepancies among infants in locomotor skill development, finding that skills such as rolling, sitting, crawling, walking, and pulling occurred in various orders, and with different cultures emphasizing and encouraging motor skill development at different times.

More recently, research has focused on the ways in which culture impacts physical skills. While some cultures may emphasize stillness and discipline in one's body movements, others may emphasize active physical activity (Bruner, 2007). Reflecting these differentials, Adolph and Berger (2015) found that caregivers in Mali and Jamaica expected infants to sit and walk at earlier ages than did caregivers in western cultures who believed that motor development occurred slowly and sequentially. Cross-cultural differences in the ages at which children sit are linked with differences in childrearing practices (Karasik et al., 2015). As Adolph and Berger (2015) write, "naive theories, parents' expectations, and everyday childrearing routines—all aspects of the social/cultural environment that Gesell had dismissed—can affect motor development" (p. 295).

Scholars have also reported sleep differences among infants across cultures. In the United States, infants are expected to sleep for long uninterrupted stretches (eight hours by four to six

months), whereas in some communities, infants wake and feed every four hours during their first eight months (Rogoff, 2003). In the latter example, mothers typically do not encourage "sleeping through the night" (Rogoff, 2003, p. 67). These examples demonstrate how cultural practices are interconnected with biological processes (Rogoff, 2003).

2.2.5.2 Cultural variation in expectations of child safety and independence

There is also cultural variation in expectations of child independence and safety concerns, which affect a child's motor skill development (Karasik et al., 2010; World Health Organization, 2006). For example, mothers in northeastern China use sandbags to toilet train their infants, keeping them physically restrained in sandbags until they are 12-24 months (Adolph & Robinson, 2015). This practice keeps them dry and safe, but delays motor development. In central Asia, mothers swaddle their infants and keep them safe in a cradle up to 20 hours a day with an external catheter that carries waste through the bottom of the cradle (Adolph & Robinson, 2015).

Cultural variation in childrearing practices extends beyond the infant years into childhood, where various expectations of children's independence affect their rates of physical development. For example, caretakers' expectations for children to feed themselves and clean up after themselves can differ across cultures (Souto-Manning, 2009), which in turn leads to the acquisition of fine and gross motor skills at different rates. While children in middle-class U.S. families are typically not regarded as independently capable of caring for themselves until age ten or later, elsewhere in the world, children's independence and sense of responsibility develops much earlier (Rogoff, 2003). In New Guinea, for example, infants safely handle knives and fire by the time they can walk (Rogoff, 2003). Rogoff (2003) posits that the age at which children develop a sense of responsibility or sufficient skill is often determined "after making some

guesses based on [individuals'] own cultural experience" (p. 6), indicating the great cultural variation therein. According to Adolph and Robinson (2015), "treating age as a predictor or independent variable confuses the passage of time with the factors actually responsible for creating developmental change; slotting children into age groups overlooks the fact that age groupings are transient and fictions of convenience" (p. 126).

2.2.5.3 Cultural variation in social and emotional development

Culture plays a significant role in children's social and emotional development. At the infant stage, cultural variations can influence children's attachment to their mothers, the period during which children require their mother's (or another caregiver's) protection and care (Rothbaum & Morelli, 2005; Rothbaum et al., 2000). Rothbaum and colleagues (2000) contend that attachment theory is based on western values and meaning, and that "what constitutes sensitive, responsive caregiving is likely to reflect indigenous values and goals, which are apt to differ from one society to the next" (p. 1096). For example, while Japanese parents tend to anticipate their child's needs through use of situational clues, parents in the United States tend to wait for their child to communicate their needs before taking steps to meet them (Rothbaum et al., 2000).

Likewise, previous notions that children universally seek to bond with their caregivers have since been challenged by research in various communities (Rogoff, 2003). For example, researchers have discovered that children from north Germany, Dogon (West Africa), and Japan all exhibited varying patterns of reaction to a procedure called the "Strange Situation," designed to evaluate children's reactions when stressed (Rogoff, 2003). Researchers noted two patterns, referred to as "anxious/resistant"—distress in the absence of the caregiver and resisting proximity while at the same time seeking contact when the caregiver returns, and

"anxious/avoidant"—low distress in the absence of the caregiver and avoidance of the caregiver when he/she returns (Rogoff, 2003, p. 114). Japanese children were more likely to demonstrate anxious resistance, perhaps symbolic of being unaccustomed to being left with strangers; West African children were also more likely to demonstrate anxious resistance, perhaps symbolic of their community responsive care practices (Rogoff, 2003). In contrast, German children were more likely to demonstrate anxious avoidance, likely reflective of early independence training (Rogoff, 2003). These differing reaction patterns demonstrate that children from distinct communities display different levels of attachment after separation from their caregiver.

Otto and colleagues (2014), in exploring stranger-child interactions across cultural contexts, similarly found that stranger-child interactions are culturally shaped by the eco-cultural environment. Their research, which explored stranger-child interactions in both children from German middle-class families as well as Cameroonian Nso farming families, found that the German stranger displayed a responsive-sensitive interaction with the child and considered the child's mother's reaction, whereas the Cameroonian stranger displayed a directive interaction style with the child and did not react to the child's mother. The study showed that culturally-specific models of educating children on interacting with strangers affected the ways in which those children related to caregivers other than their mothers.

Cultures may likewise vary in their promotion of children's independence and personal responsibility. In some households, interdependence is valued and expected in the early years, while structured preschool classrooms might differently place a high value on independence (Souto-Manning, 2009). Latinx families often prioritize the family over the individual within the context of "familism," and consequently family life and needs are prioritized over other work (Souto-Manning, 2009). Souto-Manning (2009) asserts that "Latino families may be encouraged

to become interdependent, trustworthy, and reciprocal individuals. If such values are not intrinsic to the classroom culture, children may feel conflicted" (p. 184). This variation in promotion of individual responsibility influences a child's social and emotional development. In the global North, young children are encouraged to develop their individual identities and self-reliance, while other cultures may recognize the individual primarily as part of his or her family and community identity (Bruner, 2007). Children in North America are socialized to be self-directed and independent, consequently participating in more socio-dramatic play than children in group-oriented cultures (Chen & French, 2008).

Cultural experiences also shape a child's relationships and friendships, which in turn influence his or her social and emotional development. In Japanese preschools, children typically display more physical affection for each other than do children in American preschool classrooms, where teachers encourage them to sit farther apart and keep their hands to themselves (Tobin et al., 2009). Japanese preschool classrooms value touch and encourage children to be comfortable with their own bodies (Tobin et al., 2009). Similarly, shyness in children also varies across cultures, where shyness in western cultures has been perceived as a social hurdle, while other cultures perceive shyness as a virtue (Chen & French, 2008). Children in the United States were found to be more socially engaged than children in tighter-knit and agricultural communities (Edwards, 2000). Western culture also places greater emphasis on scheduling and order, teaching young children about regulation, discipline, and authority through specific boundaries that influence their behavior, which may differ from other cultural practices (Bruner, 2007).

Variation in cultural practices extend beyond the classroom, as children learn from a young age how to define family and family roles, which may extend beyond the American

concept of nuclear family to include grandparents and other relatives (Bruner, 2007). Sibling caregiving is often emphasized in global South and non-western communities; in working-class Mexican families, for example, toddlers typically play with mixed-age children who provide support and nurturance, much like U.S. mother-child play (Rogoff, 2003). In West African villages, groups of young children of varying ages participate in child care together, overseen by one or two older siblings, from whom they learn responsibility and how to handle conflicts (Rogoff, 2003). In some Japanese preschools, spontaneous mixed-age interactions are encouraged by assigning older children as "older siblings" to younger ones (Tobin et al., 2009, p. 113). Older children tasked with caring for younger children naturally develop social and emotional skills by modeling appropriate behavior, patience, and kindness.

2.2.5.4 Cultural variation in approaches to learning

Cultural experiences at home can greatly influence a child's approach to learning and the way they acquire and synthesize information. Approaches to learning, including how young children learn, as well as their enthusiasm for learning (interest, pleasure, and motivation) and engagement in learning (focused attention, persistence, flexibility, and self-regulation) vary greatly across cultures (Hyson, 2008). As Bruner (2007) insists: "there is no universal curriculum or teaching practices for early learning and development that can simply be applied for all children—that early learning and development must be viewed within a cultural context" (p. 3). Cultural differences in approaches to learning are often conceived as a simple dichotomy of self-directed vs. cooperative learning (Reid et al., 2017). However, the structures of learning and engagement may vary across cultures, from formal adult-led environments, to open-ended and self-directed learning environments, to informal learning through observation and participation

in adult-led activities (Reid et al., 2017). Learning contexts may prioritize play and self-directed exploration, or a structured and academic approach to learning (Reid et al., 2017).

Cultural approaches to learning begin in the home and extend out to the classroom setting. Young children around the world often learn by observing and participating in family chores or errands to different degrees depending on the value parents and community places on a child's participation in the home. For example, four-year-old children in East Africa typically spend 35% of their time doing chores, and three-year-olds spend 25% of their time doing chores (Rogoff, 2003). Children in the United States spend significantly less time than their non-western counterparts doing chores and running errands for their parents. Young children in the United States learn from their parents through "playing-watching," thereby developing an understanding of various job-related tasks and skills (Rogoff, 2003, p. 137). These differences in children's opportunities to learn from "mature activities" relate to other differences in cultural patterns of raising and educating young children, including dependence on formal schooling, the value of certain cognitive skills over others, children's motivation and interests, communication between caregivers and children, and relationships with other children (Rogoff, 2003, p. 133).

Across cultures, caregivers and teachers structure the environment according to the culturally-specific ways in which they want children to learn and develop (Rogoff, 2003). Eurocentric cultural practices emphasize self-expression and free choice in play. Chinese cultural practices are partial to direct instruction to preschool-age children, focusing on how to pay attention and regulate behavior (Luo et al., 2013). Young Mayan girls in Guatemala are taught to weave using particular sequences, demonstrating joint participation in the process; dominant approaches to educating young American children prioritize freedom to explore interests and desires in a culture that favors child-directed learning (Bruner, 2007; Rogoff, 2003). In Japanese

preschools, teachers tend to allow children time and space to independently resolve issues rather than adopt the strategy dominantly favored in the United States of preemptive intervention (Tobin et al., 2009). The Japanese model favors a high student-teacher ratio in classrooms for encouraging a child's socialization and learning, unlike the western model that insists that the "quality of care necessarily deteriorates as the number of children per adult goes up" (Tobin et al., 2009, p. 120). These variations in approaches to learning—including a cultural emphasis on children's participation in the community—are closely involved in children's development and the participation in the cultural institution of western schooling (Rogoff, 2003).

2.2.5.5 Cultural variation in language and communication development

Young children's interactions with print are culturally and linguistically specific. For example, American culture values oral and written language, while other cultures may place more value on nonverbal communications (Bruner, 2007). Some Asian and Native American traditional cultures engage in much less adult-to-child verbalizations than Eurocentric prevailing norms. An example given by Rothbaum et al. (2000) is the difference between Japanese and U.S. mothers' communication with their children (where American mothers favor verbal communication over Japanese mothers' anticipation of their child's needs), which in turn leads to acquiring communication skills at differing rates. Similarly, storytelling in other cultures may vary in their patterns and messages from the American storytelling culture, which is typically defined by a linear and logical pattern (Bruner, 2007). Variations in patterns of speech and communication are key aspects of how children develop. According to Kagan, Moore, and Bredekamp (1995), "children do not acquire language skills out of context or despite a cultural milieu; rather, language is embedded in that context" (p. 34). Children acquire linguistic

competence—knowledge of grammatical rules and communicative competence—knowledge that language is used differently in different social situations (Genishi, 1981).

Cultural and linguistic development includes nonverbal cues as well as dialectical variation. Bruner (2007) believes that "failure to understand nonverbal cues that young children are acquiring in the home cultures can be detrimental to providing a strong learning environment for those children, even when that learning environment is designed to teach dominant culture skills" (p. 3).

Addressing and understanding dialectical variation is equally as important, as the example Souto-Manning (2009) gives of her experience working with a first grader named George, who was disciplined as a kindergartener for failing to use Standard English and instead speaking in African American English. The teacher's rejection of his language contributed to behavioral issues that only stopped once his language practice was met with understanding and acceptance.

2.2.5.6 Cultural variation in cognitive development and general knowledge

Cultural differences influence cognitive development, what children learn, and in what context. Vygotsky's (1978) cultural-historical theory has shifted the study of cognition in children from a focus on mental processes and the acquisition of knowledge to one that recognizes that cognitive processes develop within cultural contexts. As Rogoff (2003) explains, "cognitive development consists of individuals changing their ways of understanding, perceiving, noticing, thinking, remembering, classifying, reflecting, problem setting and solving, planning, and so on—in shared endeavors with other people building on the cultural practices and traditions of communities" (p. 237). A study conducted by Serpell (1979) demonstrated that children performed well when reproducing a pattern with materials familiar to them (strips of

wire for Zambian children), and they performed poorly when materials were unfamiliar (paper and pencil). Children's "everyday cognition" is accessed in creating patterns, calculating costs, or persuading others—skills not readily apparent in contexts unfamiliar to children (Rogoff, 2003, p. 239). Indeed, Piaget's sequence of stages assumed that development occurred on a linear track, but research in different communities using his prescriptive tasks revealed a need to explore cultural and contextual variation that might lead to differences in performance (Rogoff, 2003).

Children display differences in cognition across cultures according to their experience with formal western schooling. In the United States, children's progress is often conceived as developing along a linear dimension, measured in months, with children differentially labeled as ahead or behind in their performance or ability (Rogoff, 2003). This mentality may be at odds with minoritized community values, such as the American Indian population who extol the virtue of group participation and contribution over individual success (Rogoff, 2003). In another example, Lebanese-Australian mothers are less likely to teach their children the alphabet and are more likely to wait until an interest emerges from the child to learn to read and write, while Anglo-Australian mothers are more likely to teach their children the alphabet prior to school entry, for fear that they may already be behind (Rogoff, 2003). Children who attend schools in western settings are skilled in tests of memory in which they remember unrelated items, while children who have not experienced western schooling may not be able to recall unrelated information but can recall complicated narratives and oral history (Rogoff, 2003).

Individuals develop within their cultural communities, and their development must be understood through variations in cultural practices (Rogoff, 2003). A cultural approach to child development acknowledges that cultural communities may hold different expectations for

children's engagement in activities, with varying "timetables" of development (Rogoff, 2003, p. 4). As Rogoff (2003) posits, "questions about age of transitions are themselves based on a cultural perspective" (p. 8). An understanding of cultural variation is therefore paramount to transcend overgeneralizations that assume that human development everywhere functions the same way as for the individuals who establish developmental trajectories (Rogoff, 2003). The five domains of school readiness described above illustrate variations in cultural practices as they often appear in the context of ELDS.

2.2.6 What standards documents reveal about EBLs

This section looks at the ways in which the specific needs of emergent bilingual learners are addressed in state standards' documents, both through guides and reports of the documents themselves as well as through various research studies. The research studies are divided based on their findings in two categories: research finding ELDS fail to support EBLs, and research finding ELDS fail to support teachers of EBLs. The literature highlighted below focuses on standards for the PreK years—children between the ages of three and five years old.

2.2.6.1 Standards documents: Guides, toolkits, and position statements and EBLs

Only recently have EBL students been specifically referenced in early learning and development standards documents. While the professional association Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) developed ESL standards for PreK-12 students as early as 1997, dual language inclusivity was not formally established in ELDS (only given a passing nod) until the first systematic development of the World-class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) in 2004 (Fenner & Segota, 2012). The WIDA Early Language Development Standards are intended to provide a framework for supporting, instructing, and

assessing young EBLs ages two and a half to five and a half, with separate English Language Development Standards for grade school children.

However, The Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP) published a critical report in 2011 that found ELDS inadequately and ambiguously referenced EBL students (Matthews, 2011). At that time, only the state of Alaska had comprehensive ELDS for young children from birth through kindergarten entry, including indicators and strategies for supporting EBLs across all domains. In Massachusetts, where this research took place, a 2010 resource document published by the Massachusetts Department of Early Education and Care (EEC) specifically advocated for EBLs and their inclusion in standards.

Furthermore, ELDS documents and position statements often lump EBL students with students with disabilities under the blanket concept of "diversity" (Zepeda et al., 2011). In their 2011 guide on strategies for social and emotional learning for young children, Kendziora and colleagues reference EBLs only once, by letting readers know that "students who are English language learners or students with disabilities may have strikingly different profiles of social-emotional competencies than other students" (p. 6). Despite their starkly different needs, this learning standards guide puts EBLs into a category with students with disabilities. The document analysis that follows in this study reveals that EBLs continue to be grouped into a category with students with disabilities.

In 2015, the U.S. Department of Education's Office of English Language Acquisition released an English Learner Toolkit, which provides sample tools and resources for state and local educational agencies to use with all students. Also in 2015, the Early Childhood Learning and Knowledge Center, an Office of the Administration for Children and Families, compiled an extensive database of all United States references that support EBLs within their individual state

guidelines and standards documents. In 2017, the U.S. Departments of Health and Human Services and Education reissued a guidance document and toolkit on better supporting young EBLs in early childhood programs. These federal guidance documents and resources mark a concerted effort to support states in working with young EBLs. On June 2, 2016, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Service and the U.S. Department of Education released a joint federal policy statement: "Policy Statement on Supporting the Development of Children who are Dual Language Learners in Early Childhood Programs." This critical statement includes comprehensive policy recommendations to states and to early childhood programs with the goals of ensuring a welcoming and linguistically accessible environment for EBLs, fostering children's emergent bilingualism, and supporting the early childhood education workforce to build their capacity to effectively support EBLs. Notably, the policy statement urges states to establish state Early Learning Guidelines (ELGs)/standards that incorporate EBLs across all domains, including specific indicators unique to EBLs. The following excerpt from this federal policy statement signals the momentous shift in the discourse on standards and meeting the needs of EBLs:

> Language incorporated into ELGs specific to children who are DLLs should do more than mention DLLs. States could begin by reviewing their current ELGs to determine if they are appropriate for use with children who are DLLs. ELGs that were developed with only English monolingual children in mind are unlikely to address all areas of development and learning sufficiently for children who are DLLs. States should consider ELGs that include specific guidelines for language development in both English and children's home language. States should also include components of home language development as a normative part of the early education experience for young children who are DLLs. States should consider how various aspects of development may differ across monolingual and bilingual children, and adjust standards and expectations to fit these developmental differences. States should partner with experts and rely on research in this process. States should consult the Birth to Five Head Start Early Learning Outcomes Framework for examples of standards that appropriately include DLLs. Where there are Indian tribes in a State, States and tribes should engage in consultations to ensure unique issues related to Native languages are incorporated in State ELGs. (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and U.S. Department of Education, 2016, p. 16)

The federal toolkits and guidance documents newly released in the last five years signal a shift in the discourse on ELDS and EBLs, with particular attention to supporting states in meeting the needs of EBLs. Notably, these resources urge states to incorporate ELDS that include EBLs' linguistic repertoires and cultural knowledge, as opposed to a surface level mention that does not acknowledge their vast funds of knowledge.

2.2.6.2 Research finding ELDS do not recognize EBLs

Several studies uncovered that ELDS have failed to reference EBL students or their needs. A 2009 study by Scott-Little, Kagan, Frelow, and Reid, which focused on the implications of ELDS for three and four year-old children across 21 states for programs serving students with disabilities, simultaneously uncovered a lack of recognition within ELDS for EBL students. The authors noted that the standards did not mention EBLs, instead finding that the guidelines "related to children learning a second language were included relatively infrequently" (Scott-Little et al., 2009, p. 91). Similarly, Kagan and colleagues conducted a 2013 alignment study in Massachusetts to determine the ways in which the state standards align with assessments, as well as the ways in which they align with the state's kindergarten standards and the national Head Start Child Development and Early Learning Framework. The research found that standards for PreK did not address bilingual development. The authors strongly encouraged Massachusetts, as a state leader in early childhood, to make inclusion of EBLs within the standards a priority.

A 2007 study by Wright and colleagues found a similar lack of attention to diversity in ELDS. Their study, which analyzed the content of ELDS in nine states, with a particular focus on the standards' recognition of language and culture, also found that the standards provided little to no guidance on how to incorporate culture and diversity into standards. A lack of strategy for incorporating diversity and the needs of linguistically diverse students was echoed in the

2015 report by Espinosa and Calderón. The report analyzed the ELDS in 21 states and Washington, DC, highlighting the ELDS documents' statements of philosophy, EBL identification procedures, use of a separate domain for language development, EBL assessment recommendations, multilingual family engagement strategies, teacher qualification rules, and instructional strategies. The authors found that while states varied considerably in their support for EBLs, some failed to clearly delineate a process for identifying and assessing EBLs as well as identifying teacher qualifications for those working with EBLs.

Similarly, an earlier study by Scott-Little and colleagues (2003) called out the failure of ELDS to properly reference EBLs and their needs. The study uncovered a lack of support for EBL children in the state standards documents, with EBL students receiving neither special language nor cultural recognition or modifications in any of these documents. The authors noted that the 28 states varied in their approaches to language/literacy, indicating that this was already considered the most important domain among states to address. With the exception of Texas, the authors found that the "standards documents were silent as to how to apply the standards with English language learners" (p. 43).

Finally, a study by Neuman and Roskos (2005) found no specific reference to EBLs in the analysis of ELDS in 43 states. Looking specifically in the domain areas of literacy, language, and math for children ages three to five, the authors found considerable variation in language, descriptive levels, organization, structure, and the resources that states accessed to develop their standards, giving a slight reference to EBL students in their acknowledgment that cultural indicators should include children from "extraordinary variation" (Neuman & Roskos, 2005, p. 142). In summary, the research findings reveal little to no reference to EBLs in state standards documents, failure to address bilingual development in state documents, a lack of strategy for

supporting EBL students within the documents, as well as great variation among states in their support of EBL students through the standards documents.

2.2.6.3 Research regarding the need for more teacher education on ELDS for EBLs

This section highlights the few research studies that found that teachers were confused about or not prepared to use ELDS with their EBL students. A report by Gutiérrez et al. (2002) illuminates the challenges of one teacher in an Arizona Navajo preschool immersion program, who found native language instruction contradicted teaching to the standards documents. English was used in the classroom far more frequently, with Navajo reserved for directions and discipline. Exasperated, she wondered: "I just don't know what to do here—should I be teaching Navajo or should I be teaching to the standards?" (Gutiérrez et al., 2002, p. 332).

In Massachusetts, the Department of Early Education and Care (EEC) (2010) conducted a survey of early childhood providers in order to learn more about EBLs and their families (Zacarian et al., 2010). Among the findings from the survey and ECE site visits across Massachusetts were the consensus that providers had limited preparation to meet the needs of EBLs and were unclear on "best practices" for teaching EBLs (Zacarian et al., 2010, p. 10).

In their national study that examined standards and their role in early childhood education, DeBruin-Parecki and Slutzky (2016) explored whether preschool early learning and development standards included specific supports for teachers working with diverse populations of young children. The authors examined 54 learning standards documents and found that eleven states had strategies and indicators developed for use with emergent bilingual learners, four states had only indicators, and nine states had only teaching strategies. Of the documents reviewed, the remaining 30 did not include specific strategies or indicators related to emergent bilingual learners or teachers of emergent bilingual learners. DeBruin-Parecki and Slutzky

(2016) write that "teachers who do not receive explicit information in standards documents about diverse populations are often provided with general information statements and little more [and] this type of statement is of little use to a teacher who does not know how to make these adaptations" (p. 6). The authors caution that standards that do not account for diversity may lead teachers to believe that all children learn and develop in the same way. These studies, though there are only a few of them, indicate a need for greater teacher guidance and education in incorporating and implementing ELDS for EBLs.

2.3 Emergent Bilingual Learners: Definitions and History

2.3.1 Defining EBL, DLL, and ELL

There are several terms used to describe students who are learning English as an additional language—emergent bilingual learner (EBL), dual language learner (DLL), and English language learner (ELL). EBL children are emergent bilinguals since they become bilingual[2] through school and through their English language acquisition (García et al., 2008). The term EBL—emergent bilingual learner, is "sometimes used to emphasize that children who are simultaneously learning both their first language and English have the potential to be bilingual" (Freedberg et al., 2016, p. 2). Although the unique circumstances under which each child acquires two or more languages differ dramatically, the term EBL was chosen for this

[2] The discourse on bilingualism often centers on dual language learning, which is the means by which emergent bilingual students typically learn in school, in both their native language and the dominant culture's language, which in the United States is English. In this paper I define dual language learners as emergent bilinguals, as they are becoming bilingual through their school and home languages (García & Kleifgen, 2010). Consistent with how García and Kleifgen (2010) view emergent bilinguals, young children are seen not for their limitations, but for their potential to become bilingual, and thus bilingualism is recognized as an educational resource and asset. This view of bilingualism maintains high expectations of emergent bilingual children so that their strengths are built upon, rather than focus on English as a limitation (García & Kleifgen, 2010). Moreover, this view of bilingualism understands that young emergent bilingual children are developing a complex language practice, and therefore emphasizes the value of *translanguaging*—that is—a communicative system in which children shift between two languages, without trying to foster an exclusive English language practice (García & Kleifgen, 2010; García & Wei, 2015).

paper because it is generally accepted as inclusive and values bilingualism as an asset as opposed to a deficit or problem that needs fixing (García & Kleifgen, 2010; García et al., 2008). The term EBL is not unique to a particular age group, but rather refers to all children who are developing bilingually.

According to García and Kleifgen (2010), using the term emergent bilingual over the terms DLL or ELL allows students to be seen for their potential to become bilingual, which is recognized as a cognitive, social, and educational resource as opposed to being regarded as limited or merely learning English. Unlike the term EBL, which focuses on what students can do and avoids deficit perceptions, the term DLL—Dual Language Learner, specifically refers to a particular time frame—from birth through age five—during which a young student is still developing his or her native language while simultaneously beginning to learn English (Espinosa, 2013; Espinosa & García, 2012; Freedberg et al., 2016; García et al., 2008; Goldenberg et al., 2013; Hammer et al., 2014; Office of Head Start, 2009). However, as with any categorization, there are inherent limitations to the DLL classification that are often associated with "language deficiencies," "communication barriers," and "delayed language abilities" which can have negative implications for a student's schooling (García et al., 2008; Souto-Manning & Martell, 2016).

Unlike the term DLL, which spans the acquisition of language from birth through age five, the term ELL—English Language Learner, refers to the years between kindergarten through grade 12, during which students are learning English yet are regarded as not being able to fully participate in mainstream English instruction (Freedberg et al., 2016; National Council of Teachers of English, 2008). ELLs are described as "generally older, non-native English speakers who have gained proficiency in their native language and are now learning English in addition to

mastering academic content" (The National Conference of State Legislatures, 2018, para. 3). The NCLB Act described ELLs as students "whose difficulties in speaking, reading, writing, or understanding the English language may be sufficient to deny the individual the ability to meet the State's proficient level of achievement on State assessments" (Education Commission of the States, 2014, para. 4).

According to the American Psychological Association (APA) (2012), students are classified as English Language Learners through informal questionnaires or surveys filled out by the students' parents. Information used to classify ELLs is typically gathered through a survey, though parents, fearing academic repercussions for their children, can be untruthful of their language backgrounds (Abedi, 2004). The classification of ELLs is based on criteria such as ethnicity, immigrant status, or years lived in the U.S. (Solano-Flores & Trumbull, 2003). ELLs in the United States have over 400 different language backgrounds, yet the majority (80%) are Spanish speakers (Goldenberg, 2008; U.S. DOE National Center for Education Statistics, 2018). The majority of elementary-age ELLs are U.S.-born; 82% in PreK through grade 5, and 65% in grades 6 through 12 (Mitchell, 2016).

The EBL, DLL, and ELL subgroups are culturally heterogeneous, as students come from diverse backgrounds (Abedi, 2004). While the present study focuses on all emergent bilingual learners in early childhood, there is an inherent shortcoming in lumping all ethnically and linguistically minoritized children into the category EBL, DLL, or ELL, since there are personal, social, linguistic, economic and cultural distinctions among these groups (Castro et al., 2011). Understandably, the specific cultural and linguistic needs of EBL students have the potential to get lost in the vast category of which they are a part. For example, the EBL category equally includes students whose native languages use all different types of alphabets—from Latin to

Cyrillic, Arabic to Hebrew, as well as non-alphabetic scripts. Additionally, EBL students come from cultures where books are read right to left, top to bottom, and left to right.

2.3.2 History of EBLs in the U.S. and in Massachusetts

Historically, EBLs were located in a small number of states with large immigrant populations, such as California and Texas (Gottfried & Kim, 2015). Today, EBL populations are spread across the country. While EBLs come from diverse backgrounds, the majority (43%) of EBL children have either one or both parents of Mexican heritage, while 20% have parents born in Central America, 22% have parents born in Asia or the Middle East and a combined 15% have parents born in Africa, Central and Eastern Europe, and Western Europe and Australia (Fortuny et al., 2010). Several authors (Crosnoe, 2007; Gottfried & Kim, 2015; Turney & Kao, 2009) have defined children from immigrant families as children who immigrated with their families (first-generation children) or who were born in the U.S. to immigrant parents (second-generation children).

In line with the national trend in the growing Spanish-speaking student population, in Massachusetts 69% of public school students classified as English Language Learners (ELLs) speak Spanish as their native language (Zacarian et al., 2010). The next largest language group is Portuguese (9.8%), followed by Chinese (4.5%), Cape Verdean (4.1%), Haitian Creole (3.9%), Arabic (3.4%), Vietnamese (2.5%), Khmer (1.7%), Russian (1.3%), and French (.8%) (MA DESE, 2017). While 18.5% of Massachusetts' public school students speak a language other than English at home, only about 8.5% of public school students are enrolled as ELLs (Massachusetts Language Opportunity Coalition, n.d.). In Massachusetts state policy, the term ELL is used to describe a child who either does not speak English or whose native language is

not English, and who is unable to perform classroom tasks in English (see section 3.1 for a more detailed description of ELL/EBL terminology; Rennie Center, 2013).

While there is ample data on ELLs/EBLs in K-12 in Massachusetts, data on EBLs in early childhood is harder to find. One possible explanation for this discrepancy is that the historically informal nature of the early childhood sphere has made consistent data collection across different systems problematic. As of 2015, however, Massachusetts tracks enrollment of EBL preschoolers in state PreK programs (NIEER, 2015). In 2015, 25% of 3 and 4-year-olds in Massachusetts were identified as DLLs, while roughly 11% of 3 and 4-year-old DLLs were served in state PreK (NIEER, 2015). In 2016, 25% of 3 and 4-year-olds in Massachusetts were still identified as DLLs, while the percent of DLL preschool enrollment increased to 15% (NIEER, 2017).

In the city of Boston, the largest public school district in Massachusetts with 54,312 students in 2015, over three quarters of the students (78%) come from families of low-income, nearly half (47%) speak a language other than English as their native language, and 30% are classified as ELLs (Berardino, 2015). Latinx students are the largest student group in Boston, comprising 41% of Boston school's total enrollment (Berardino, 2015). Latinx students in Boston who are classified as ELLs come from a number of Central and South American countries as well as from Caribbean islands: 27% Puerto Rican, 27% Dominican, 11% El Salvadorian, 7% Columbian, 6% Mexican, and 5% Guatemalan (Berardino, 2015). Nearly half (47%) of Latinx students in Boston are classified as ELLs (Berardino, 2015). In Boston Public Schools, approximately 49% of preschool students are EBLs (The Mayor's Advisory Committee on Universal Pre-Kindergarten, 2016). Because Boston reflects national trends in changing linguistic demographics, and because the state tracks EBL enrollments, Boston Public Schools

presents a good case in which to study perceptions of ELDS as these pertain to the education of EBL students in PreK.

2.4 Historical, Political, and Legal Context of Bilingual Education Emergence in the U.S.

2.4.1 1700s – 1900s: Influx of immigrants and a reactive response to bilingual education

The United States has historically absorbed immigrants who exchange their language and culture in return for a new American identity (Malakoff & Hakuta, 1990). The United States is often referred to as a melting pot of languages and cultures—a once endearing term that, some scholars now argue, reflects an implicit national campaign to homogenize language and culture (De La Torre, 2009). As new immigrants flooded the country beginning in the early 1880s, there arose a passive acceptance of multilingualism both on the streets and in the schools.

Throughout the 1800s, an early form of bilingual education where native language speaking was tolerated alongside English instruction was practiced de facto in public schools across the country, with new immigrants defending their attachment to their native languages (Ovando, 2003). For example, many German-Americans were allowed to educate their children using German-language and bilingual instruction, so much so that by 1900 around 4% of the country's elementary school population was taught exclusively or partly in German (Kloss, 1998; Ovando, 2003; Wiley & de Korne, 2014). Bilingual education in the United States, while not specific to early childhood education, became a practical, reactive response to an overwhelming immigrant population more so than a direct government policy.

In the late 1800s, the United States government sought to formalize language policy in western bilingual states (Crawford, 1992). In the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, where the U.S. annexed a large part of Mexican territory, the rights of the Spanish speaking population were implicitly affirmed, though without explicit mention to protecting language rights

(Crawford, 1992). By the time California's Constitution was drafted in 1879, however, the rights of the Spanish speaking population were no longer guaranteed and instead, conducting all official proceedings in English, California became one of the first English only states that same year (Crawford, 1992). As the United States added more territories to the nation—including Hawaii and Puerto Rico, and temporarily the Philippines—the English language became of primary importance as the government imposed English as the language of instruction in schools (Crawford, 1992; Wiley & de Korne, 2014). With the growing number of immigrants entering the country, the U.S. government began to introduce pervasive English-only policies. Under the Naturalization Act of 1906, for example, immigrants were required to speak English in order to become naturalized U.S. citizens (Ovando, 2003).

2.4.2 1900s – Post WWI: Nationalism and English Language Learners

In the early 1900s the government sponsored bills that provided significant federal aid to states to financially support the teaching of English to new immigrants, and by 1923, 34 states required English-only instruction in all primary schools (Kloss, 1998; Ovando, 2003). Though it ruled against an English-only restriction on the use of foreign languages in Nebraska schools, the Supreme Court decision in *Meyer v. Nebraska* in 1923 affirmed the right of the state to mandate that English be the common and official language of instruction (Wiley & de Korne, 2014). This approach to teaching non-monolingual English speakers has historically been known as "sink or swim," or submersion, leaving the onus on the child rather than the school to adjust to American society and culture (Crawford & Krashen, 2007; Malakoff & Hakuta, 1990; Ovando, 2003).

The spirit of nationalism that followed the First World War propelled such a strong anti-German sentiment that the United States banned teaching German as a foreign language in public schools (Malakoff & Hakuta, 1990; Ovando, 2003; Wiley, 2007). Discrimination based on

language and culture made its way into the American educational landscape. Asian Americans particularly suffered from the legal segregation of public schools that sought to Americanize the immigrant population by banning native languages (Wollenberg, 1995). Italian, Irish, Polish, and Jewish children dropped out of school early and often did not enter high school (Valdés, 1997).

Simultaneous to the post-WWI nationalism, tracking, or organizing students according to their academic and cognitive abilities, became common practice. Under this design, IQ tests, touted as progressive and scientific, were developed to assess students, with the unintended consequence of segregating them according to cognitive ability (Tyack, 1974). In the United States, IQ tests were first used in 1913 by prominent psychologist and eugenicist Henry Herbert Goddard to evaluate immigrants coming to the United States at Ellis Island. In his glaringly small and biased study that paid no attention to linguistic ability, Goddard found that 25 of the 30 Jewish participants tested were "unintelligent" (Menken, 2008). Shortly thereafter, in 1918, Carl Brigham, a psychologist and pioneer in the field of psychometrics compared the performance of two million World War I draftees using IQ testing and found that recent immigrants had the lowest scores. His study significantly contributed to the emergence of the perceived bilingual-ethnic minority "handicap" (Menken, 2008; Ortiz, 2012). Brigham later developed the Scholastic Achievement Test (SAT), which continues to be used today for higher education admissions in the United States.

IQ tests were used to uphold racial segregation in the 20th century and tracked students into particular educational programs (Menken, 2008). For example, when IQ tests delivered to Mexican American children in English returned low scores, a vocational curriculum was implemented to address their specific needs and abilities (Tyack, 1974; Valdés, 1997). IQ tests still play a large role in educational decision making, for example, in determining children's

placement into gifted programs. Adelson, Geva, and Fraser (2014) contend that IQ testing has inherent cultural and linguistic biases, even in non-verbal assessments. They caution that IQ assessments can over or under identify English language learners as requiring special education services since, paying little attention to native language use, they may not accurately reflect their abilities. Menken (2008) astutely notes that white children are overrepresented in gifted programs, while Latinx, African-Americans, and English language learners are conversely overrepresented in special education programs. Discrimination based on language and culture and an emphasis on English-only instruction defined the early 1900s in American schools.

2.4.3 WWII – 1980s: International competition, Civil Rights, and inclusionary policies emerge

Just prior to and during World War II, the United States had a slow and deliberate immigration procedure based on the 1924 Immigration Act that set annual quotas for immigration by country (United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, n.d.). By 1940, Americans feared that German Nazis would send spies to the United States in the disguise of refugees and began to carefully vet all potential immigrants. Once the United States entered the war in December 1941, immigration to the country essentially ceased (United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, n.d.). Fear and distrust of the foreign warring nations, which extended to their innocent civilians who had immigrated to the U.S.—most notably with the cruel encampment of Japanese-Americans—persisted. The result of both WWI and WWII was the cessation of bilingualism in public schools, with German-English and Japanese-English programs faring the worst (Rong & Preissle, 2008).

World War II sparked a paradigm shift in how the nation viewed foreign language acquisition, from an English-only ideology to a sudden increase in foreign language instruction.

Following WWII, global distrust fueled competition, and foreign language acquisition, in addition to math and science skills became a top priority for the country's national defense agenda. This time the rival nation was the Soviet Union, and the war—the Cold War—was fought in ideology, economics and politics. With the Soviet's 1957 launch of Sputnik, the first artificial earth satellite, and the perceived threat of Soviet military prowess, the United States responded by developing the National Defense Education Act in 1958, which aimed to increase the teaching of foreign language education in the United States and provided generous fellowships to foreign language teachers (Malakoff & Hakuta, 1990; Ovando, 2003). Ironically, the United States was simultaneously promoting the study of foreign languages for monolingual English students while advancing an English-only curriculum throughout the country's school systems (Ovando, 2003).

It was not until the 1964 Civil Rights Act and subsequent founding of the Office for Civil Rights that the plight of English language learners garnered legal legitimacy as their rights in the classroom were championed and discrimination based on race or national origin became a federal crime. The 1964 Civil Rights Act required public schools to ensure that ELLs can participate in school programs and services, and that their limited English skills should not interfere with their access to educational opportunities. This coincided with the 1965 Immigration Act that ended a national quota system and rescinded the 1906 Naturalization Act, allowing huge numbers of immigrants from Asia and Latin America to enter U.S. schools (Ovando, 2003).

The Bilingual Education Act (BEA), which was enacted in 1968 and reauthorized five times before becoming part of the 2001 *No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act* (Title III), was established to protect the rights of English language learners. The BEA of 1968 provided that the

federal government should protect against discrimination and also support instruction for English learners. As Ovando (2003) explains:

> For the first time in American educational history, the federal government embarked on an educational experiment that sought to build upon students' home cultures, languages, and prior experiences in such a way that they could start learning without first being proficient in English. (p. 8)

The BEA's insidious agenda, however, was its "language as a problem" approach, which negatively viewed native languages of minority populations, effectively thwarting bilingual language instruction in American classrooms (Grooms, 2011).

Civil Rights activists protested, arguing that the unspecific nature of the act as well as the voluntary participation from school districts was unconstitutional (Stewner-Manzanares, 1988). Influenced largely by the *Lau v. Nichols* case and the Equal Opportunity Act of 1974 (discussed in greater detail below in section 4.6), the BEA was amended in 1974 to specify the definition of bilingual education as one that provides instruction in both English and in the native language of the student, rendering ESL programs alone insufficient (Stewner-Manzanares, 1988). The BEA was amended a second time in 1978, broadening the definition of eligible students who could receive funding to include a wider range of English language learners (Stewner-Manzanares, 1988). In 1984, the BEA was revised a third time to address the need for increased state and local school district flexibility in implementing programs for English language learners (Stewner-Manzanares, 1988). In 1988, for the fourth time, the BEA was reauthorized in the Hawkins-Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Act, which valued a pluralistic approach to educating students, whereby states were given the autonomy to determine and meet the needs of their particular English learner populations (Stewner-Manzanares, 1988). The BEA was amended a fifth time in 1994, introducing new grant categories, promoting bilingualism, and accounting for indigenous languages (Wiese & García, 1998). In all of the amendments,

bilingual instruction was not made mandatory but rather encouraged in the programs designed.

The amended BEA was a significant advancement for bilingual education, as schools that received federal funds had to demonstrate how they were supporting their English language learners. The BEA required that English language learner students receive the same quality education that monolingual students received; it also required the provision of high quality instructional programs as well as special programs meant just for English language learners. The BEA amendments also led to a significant funding increase for English language learner students, thus enabling the provision of services to more bilingual students. The BEA lent some, but far from perfect, cohesion to U.S. language policy, as policies heretofore were inconsistent over time and for different populations.

2.4.4 1980s – Present: Disunity and variation in bilingual education policy

While the early 1980s was a period of strong development of bilingual programs (Porter, 1998), some states were very direct in preventing bilingual education initiatives by the 1990s. In 1994, California passed Proposition 187, a ballot initiative that prevented undocumented immigrants from accessing education and health services, followed by Proposition 227 in 1998, effectively banning bilingual education in the state of California in favor of English only instruction. A similar ballot initiative, known as Question 2, passed successfully in the state of Massachusetts in 2002 as previously noted, banning bilingual education in the state, the details of which are outlined in later sections.

While there has been no federal policy eliminating bilingual education, the slow siphoning of funds away from bilingual education programs has been a serious encroachment of the ability to carry out the law. Unlike the atmosphere of acceptance that permeated the 1960s and 1970s, the 1980s under the Reagan and Bush administrations became rife with anti-bilingual

education sentiment, in large part due to the efforts of anti-bilingual education activist groups (García & Kleifgen, 2010; Ovando, 2003). Though the BEA endorsed programs supporting bilingual education, each reauthorization brought more restrictions in the use of funds, with programs that helped students to learn English more quickly prioritized (Crawford & Krashen, 2007; García & Kleifgen, 2010).

In 2001, when the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 was reauthorized as the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), the BEA disappeared as standalone legislation and was incorporated as Title III, Part A, the English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act; in effect, Title III, Part A of NCLB, the English Language Acquisition Act, replaced Title VII of the ESEA (Severns, 2012). Notably, however, the word "bilingual" was removed from the title, suggesting a shift from two-language learning to English immersion without native language instruction (Galvez, 2013; Hellinger & Pauwels, 2007). Part A of Title III of NCLB (Title III) prompted a shift from an emphasis on bilingual learning to one that demanded learning English as soon as possible, even requiring EBLs to take the same standardized test as their monolingual English speaking peers (Galvez, 2013). Language instruction increasingly emphasized academic content over language acquisition, giving English language learners the additional challenge of learning English while simultaneously mastering academic content (Brown & DiRanna, 2012). Schools were also held accountable for their student's English language proficiency and progress.

Recipients of Title III funds had to develop appropriate and high quality programs that met the needs of English language learners (Massachusetts Association for Bilingual Education [MABE], n.d.). Under Title III, states had more flexibility to choose how to address the needs of English learners, opting to support them through specific programs, English-only instruction,

promoting bilingual education, or developing a pull-out method with ESL classes (Severns, 2012). This flexibility among states caused concern that some states did not adequately support their English learner students or provide sufficient funding to support their education (Severns, 2012).

Under NCLB, assessments and testing requirements for English learners emphasized English-only instruction through English-only curriculum, materials, language use, and standards. This emphasis spilled over into the Common Core State Standards, an educational initiative that detailed what students should know in English language arts and mathematics at the end of each grade, which were encouraged (but not mandated) by NCLB (Menken & Solorza, 2014). Under NCLB, schools were required to report the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for reading, math, and science for all students (García & Kleifgen, 2010). With few exceptions, all EBL students were included in state assessment systems in English. In fact, in a catch-22 of cause and effect, Menken and Solorza's (2014) research in New York City indicates that schools eliminated their bilingual education programs and replaced them with English-only programs directly because of the accountability requirements set forth by NCLB. The Common Core State Standards pushed an English-only agenda by only mentioning supports needed for EBLs in the addendum of the document, with the result of marginalizing bilingual students (Yettick, 2014).

In addition to the English-only mentality within NCLB, the landmark federal protections granted to EBLs in *Lau v. Nichols* began to erode. In 2001, Title VI protections began to fade when it limited the ability to file lawsuits to government agencies. These lawsuits had to show an intent to discriminate, not solely unequal access and impact. Under *Flores v. Arizona* (1992), a case that centered on whether the state provided sufficient resources to its EBL students, support

for bilingual education further faded, and state legislators managed to avoid complying with the court's order to increase funding for EBLs.

In December 2015, a momentous shift in education policy occurred when the U.S. Senate passed the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), reauthorizing the ESEA for the first time since 2001. The ESSA gives states much more flexibility in how to improve their schools and equitably serve marginalized students, including EBLs. Notably, while Title III, which serves EBLs, is authorized to receive a financial boost, the number of EBLs has also increased considerably, minimizing the potency of this financial investment (Williams, 2015). While districts still monitor EBL students' progress towards English proficiency, low performance on these metrics does not financially penalize the schools in terms of Title III funding. Under ESSA, states need to report on EBLs and have the option of both excluding test results for newly arrived EBLs and including formally classified EBLs for the purposes of state reporting for up to four years (Triplett, 2015; Williams, 2015).

However, inequities for bilingual students still exist in the educational sphere. Unequal student access to resources, particularly for non-monolingual English speaking students, remains an issue. Within K-12 schools, segregation by language proficiency is as commonplace as segregation by age, grade, achievement level and ability (Baglieri et al., 2011). The non-monolingual English speaking student is often labeled insufficient, not proficient, and limited—negative terminology that sticks with the student throughout his or her tenure in school and undoubtedly, beyond (García & Kleifgen, 2010).

2.4.5 Language hierarchy and raciolinguistic ideology

The historical narrative of bilingual education in the United States is best understood alongside its sociopolitical context. The two modalities of bilingual education—learning English

as a non-monolingual English speaker, and learning a foreign language as a monolingual English speaker—represent the hegemonic power structure within the American education system and society. Monolingual English-speaking students are celebrated when they can minimally speak a foreign language, yet multilingual learners whose communicative practices cut across named languages (e.g., Spanish, English, French) are held to a higher standard and expected to achieve fluency in the same time period. Cervantes-Soon (2014) asserts that acquiring an additional language for English-dominant children is highly lauded as advanced academic achievement while learning Standard English for students who are linguistically minoritized is regarded as a baseline academic achievement necessary to remove the at-risk label assigned to them. Valdés finds this double standard a gross example of educational inequality where power has been distributed top down from a monolingual English-centric perspective that views bilingualism with a problem-oriented focus.

Valdés (1997) devoted fieldwork to studying the differential expectations monolingual English-speaking children are held to as compared with those of emergent bilingual learners. She argues that dual language education for monolingual English-language learners who study a foreign language is generally accompanied by challenging instruction while multilingual learners who are learning English are not necessarily exposed to the highest quality educational instruction. Gort and colleagues (2012) similarly found that teachers in parallel Spanish and English-medium read-aloud activities asked more inference-based and factual questions during the Spanish-based read alouds and more experience-based and word-focused—and therefore more cognitively challenging—questions during the English-based read alouds.

Consistent with this language hierarchy, a raciolinguistic ideology contends that "racialized speaking" individuals are linguistically deficient when those same practices would be

positioned as normative when enacted by white and privileged individuals (Flores & Rosa, 2015; Rosa & Flores, 2017). Racialized language practices—the negative characteristics assigned to language that reflect stereotypes of "inferiority as a people"—have systematically marginalized populations (García, 2009, p. 111). Rosa and Flores (2017) connect critical language research with critical race scholarship in order to understand the historical and structural processes that stigmatize people and perpetuate deficit perspectives.

Raciolinguistic perspectives have historically been used to position Indigenous people as subhuman and as having limited legitimate language abilities (Flores, 2019; Rosa & Flores, 2017). This longstanding racialized ideology has "morphed into the framing of colonized subjects as less evolved humans than Europeans," legitimizing their persecution, and contributing to the origins of a Eurocentric framing of "appropriate" cultural norms (Rosa & Flores, 2017, p. 624). This ideology proposes that Indigenous communities must replace their heritage language, deemed "exotic" and "antimodern" with a European language in order to fit in as a modern citizen (Rosa & Flores, 2017, p. 625).

Flores (2019) argues that we must challenge the colonialism that has historically produced raciolinguistic ideologies and that continues to marginalize language practices and position students as language deficient. The racialization of students due to their linguistic practices or disability labels also has consequences for EBLs in their exclusion from bilingual programs (Cioè-Peña, 2020). As a result of this raciolinguistic ideology, EBLs are framed as requiring linguistic remediation in order to access "academic language" without the acknowledgement that "academic language" is not a neutral, but a sociopolitical construct, which serves to uphold racialized linguistic hierarchies (Rosa & Flores, 2017). This notion is echoed by Flores and Rosa (2015) who argue that EBLs' linguistic practices are framed as deficient no

matter how closely they follow "rules of appropriateness," linking a white, Eurocentric norm to the "appropriate" approach and serving as compass to "appropriate norms" in language education and in education writ large.

2.4.6 Education policy for young EBL children

For young EBL children, the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG), Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), and Head Start, continue to be the three major federal programs that financially support subsidized services for young children. CCDBG provides child care assistance to low-income families, provided that states match and maintain the financial commitment, and TANF funds can be spent by states on child care assistance or be directed (up to 30%) towards CCDBG. Head Start, the primary early childhood education program in the United States for poor children, serves more than one million children per year. Among Head Start's comprehensive services are health, nutrition, and social services for mothers and families. Federal regulations (such as the Head Start Early Learning Outcomes Framework), as well as state regulations (such as Massachusetts' Question 2 which limits bilingual programs), both influence the types of early childhood programs and services for EBL children (Espinosa, 2013).

Since its inception, Head Start has prioritized serving the needs of linguistic and cultural minorities and immigrant populations, requiring its programs to provide resources specific to EBLs and immigrant and refugee families, such as utilizing culturally and linguistically appropriate screening and assessment tools (McNamara, 2016). Head Start policy regulations recognize bilingualism as a strength and encourage family and community engagement. Head Start has shown to have strong effects for EBLs in vocabulary development and early numeracy (Bloom & Weiland, 2015), and greater likelihood of high school and college graduation for

EBLs (Bauer & Schanzenbach, 2016). These priorities, specifically through the Head Start Early Learning Outcomes Framework and the Head Start Program Performance Standards, have had a ripple effect on state policy as they serve as a model for states to recognize linguistic and cultural diversity.

2.4.7 Role of the courts and the legal emergence of bilingual education

Both federal and state courts have played a significant role in propelling bilingual education initiatives. A landmark case at the federal level came in 1974 in the Supreme Court decision of *Lau v. Nichols*, where 1,800 Chinese students in California filed a lawsuit protesting insufficient language support in the classroom, which established a right to equal access to the same curriculum as other students. This decision was based on Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and not on the 14th Amendment in the U.S. Constitution, which provides equal protection for all citizens. Subsequently, the Equal Educational Opportunity Act (EEOA) of 1974 passed, requiring school districts to take "appropriate action to overcome language barriers that impede equal participation by its students in the instructional programs" (Ovando, 2003, p. 10). While the EEOA was specific to school-age children, the *Lau v. Nichols* case was a breakthrough for early childhood education as the courts ruled that everyone, including young children, have the right to access language support in the classroom.

Further court decisions advanced the cause of students learning the English language. In the *Serna v. Portales* case (1974), the court ruled that native Spanish speaking students in New Mexico did not have their needs met in the public school system, which prompted the development of bilingual education programs in that state. The 1978 case law of *Rios v. Reed* similarly found that Spanish speaking students in New York had inadequate support, including a lack of educated bilingual teachers and a poorly detailed curriculum, resulting in stronger support

for high quality bilingual education. Following the passage of the EEOA in 1974, the 1981 *Castañeda v. Pickard* case law from Texas and the EEOA propelled the development of a three-pronged test to determine whether schools are taking appropriate steps to address the needs of EBLs (Wiley, 2007). The 1999 *Flores v. Arizona* lawsuit ruled in favor of Arizona's EBL student population, finding that the state of Arizona provided inadequate support for EBLs (Jimenez-Castellanos et al., 2013). These federal and state court cases collectively propelled bilingual education initiatives through their rulings on native language use and instructional supports in the classroom.

2.4.8 Massachusetts and its overthrow of bilingual education

Massachusetts is one of the few states to have banned bilingual education in favor of English-only instruction. With the passing of Question 2 in 2002, Massachusetts effectively banned bilingual education in the state after advocates argued bilingual education was a failed experiment (Tamayo et al., 2002). The basis of the argument against bilingual education was that students who went through the bilingual education system never learned to read, write or even speak English properly. Instead, sheltered English immersion, the English-only model of instruction promoted in Question 2, would place students in classes to teach them English as quickly as possible in order to subsequently place them in general education classes. Question 2 was spearheaded by California millionaire Ron Unz and the organization English for the Children of Massachusetts, who argued that English immersion worked successfully in California where test scores of EBLs increased significantly in the three years since beginning the one-year English immersion program (Crawford & Krashen, 2007). He also argued that bilingual education programs unnecessarily segregated minority students and denied English language learners their right to learn English (Fichtenbaum, 2004). Unz was responsible for

pushing the Question 2 proposal to a ballot measure (and gave large monetary investments to make this possible), which was subsequently passed by a majority of 68% (Smardon, 2011). While the initiative met with vehement opposition from both teachers and parents alike, the English-only argument has continued to grow a support base as English-only bills have headed to Congress from Arizona, Florida, and Texas.

Constituents in Massachusetts have tried, unsuccessfully, to fight Question 2 in the years since it passed. However, in July 2017, the Massachusetts state senate passed the Language Opportunity for Our Kids (LOOK) Act, which gives schools in Massachusetts the flexibility to establish programs apart from the sheltered English immersion (SEI) model that the state requires in order to better meet the needs of their linguistically minoritized students. In June 2017, the House passed the legislation for the LOOK Act, the Senate followed by passing the legislation in July, and the resulting Act passed in November 2017. This Act softens the one-size-fits all English-only approach by allowing districts flexibility to establish the English learner programs that best meet the needs of their students, which may include SEI, two-way immersion, transitional bilingual, or other programs. The programs must be research-based and teach subject matter and the English language (Framingham Source, July 8, 2016; Massachusetts Language Opportunity Coalition, 2017).

2.5 Research Support for Bilingual Education and Bilingualism: Linguistic, Academic, and Cognitive Benefits

2.5.1 Linguistic benefits of bilingual education

While theories of child development serve to highlight the ways in which knowledge is acquired in children, theories of language learning provide a more specific model of knowledge acquisition (language) that is particularly significant to the EBL student, who, by definition,

learns more than one language at a time. Cummins' (1984, 1979) theories of language learning—linguistic interdependence and academic language—support the benefits of bilingualism in influencing cognitive and linguistic development in school-age children. Cummins hypothesizes that proficiency in a child's native language (L1) helps the child develop proficiency in a second language (L2). In his theory of linguistic interdependence, a child's L1 and L2 support each other and propel the acquisition of knowledge. Further, Cummins (1984) theorizes that there are distinctions between how language is used informally in conversation and how language is used in the classroom.

Cummins categorizes language development into basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS), used both inside and outside the classroom, and cognitive-academic language proficiency (CALP), used exclusively to succeed inside the classroom. BICS refers to conversational language fluency as contextualized language, which individuals use for basic interpersonal communication (García et al., 2008). BICS skills can be met in one to three years and include the ability to effectively communicate one's needs in conversation using oral language. Contextualized language, used for BICS, can be external, related to language input, or internal, related to the shared experiences of the people engaging in conversation (García et al., 2008). Unlike BICS, CALP refers to a higher level of language proficiency that can be met in four to seven years, sometimes longer. While developing social or conversational language skills can happen relatively quickly, developing the complex, abstract, and cognitively demanding academic language of a classroom can take significantly longer to master (Cummins, 2000).

The skills for CALP include the ability to engage in higher order cognitive and linguistic practices and the ability to clearly and effectively communicate one's thoughts. In PreK, academic language proficiency might involve, for example, knowing the names of colors in

English and being able to understand questions in English that lead to comprehension (Severns, 2012). CALP, Cummins (1984) explains, requires formal instruction and is necessary for a student's long-term academic success. CALP is the force behind the shift from "learning to read" to "reading to learn" around fourth grade (APA, 2012, p. 45). CALP requires the use of abstract language in order to participate in the classroom, read certain texts, and complete school tasks (García et al., 2008). While these data represent elementary school-age children, Cummins' findings are still relevant for the study of language development at an earlier age. In fact, he cautions against abandoning the L1 in a child's early years, before the language is fully developed. He argues that, for children "whose L1 skills are less well developed in certain respects, intensive exposure to L2 in the initial grades is likely to impede the continued development of L1" (Cummins, 1979, p. 233). Moreover, this early emphasis on English as the language of power reinforces a hierarchy that undermines EBL children's language capabilities, including translanguaging practices (Souto-Manning & Rabadi-Raol, 2018).

Translanguaging is a critically important and sophisticated skill for young EBLs that furthers their ability to communicate (Axelrod, 2018; Bengochea et al., 2018). EBLs' capacity to code switch is a cognitive and linguistic resource that demonstrates their sociolinguistic and sociocultural competence (Gort, 2012). Translanguaging pedagogy for EBLs recognizes the important resources that students bring with them to the classroom, and builds upon their entire linguistic and cultural repertoires (Ascenzi-Moreno, 2017; Gort & Sembiante, 2015). Young EBLs' ways of approaching language learning must be rooted in play (which creates a zone of proximal development) and social interactions (Axelrod, 2014; Yoon, 2019).

The process by which young children learn multiple languages can take many forms. Young EBL children learn a second language either simultaneous to learning their native

language, or sequentially, after acquiring linguistic competence in their native language, which occurs at about three years old (Espinosa & López, 2007; McLaughlin, 1984). For children for whom a second language is learned sequentially, the child's ability to learn the language is particularly sensitive to the learning environment. Some EBLs receive little to no English language exposure prior to their PreK classroom, others will have little to no native language interactions prior to their PreK classroom, and some children will have extensive bilingual exposure in their early years (Castro et al., 2011).

Young EBL children who acquire pre-literacy skills in their native language are better equipped to learn English (Severns, 2012). Specifically, teaching students to first read in their native language promotes higher levels of reading achievement in English as well as improved overall English language learning (August & Hakuta, 1997; Bialystok, 2007; Goldenberg, 2008). This research was corroborated in 2006 when the National Literacy Panel found that five individual meta-analyses (Greene, 1997; Rolstad et al., 2005; Slavin & Cheung, 2005; Willig, 1985) all came to the same conclusion that children achieve greater reading achievement in English when they are taught to read in their native language as well (Goldenberg, 2010). Further evidence supporting native language instruction alongside English instruction comes from the 2015 study by Mendez and colleagues that found EBL preschoolers who were involved in a program where instruction was culturally and linguistically responsive in both Spanish and English had significantly higher scores on Spanish and English vocabulary assessments than a control group of EBL children who received instruction in English only.

The use of a child's native language alongside English instruction does not delay the acquisition of an English vocabulary but rather supports it, even more effectively than instruction in English alone (Mendez et al., 2015). This argument is supported in the 2012 study by Dixon

and colleagues that explored the literature of second language acquisition in PreK through grade 12. After reviewing 71 education studies focusing on foreign language education, child language research, sociocultural studies, and psycholinguistics, Dixon concluded that strong home literacy practices and skills in a child's native language can lead to successful second language development. Furthermore, Dixon and her colleagues found that effective teachers of English language learners are proficient in the child's native language.

2.5.2 Academic benefits of bilingual education

Research studies have found there are many long-term academic benefits for dual language learning (Carlisle et al., 1999; Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Peal & Lambert, 1962; Valentino & Reardon, 2014). When the languages of the home are integrated into the classroom culture and discussions, it creates an environment conducive to high academic achievement (Crawford & Krashen, 2007). Though the following studies do not focus on the preschool early childhood years, they provide valuable insight into language learning and achievement in school for EBLs.

Children who learn English alongside their native language in a traditional bilingual education model are found to have higher levels of verbal and nonverbal intelligence than monolingual children (Peal & Lambert, 1962). The groundbreaking study conducted with 10-year-old children by Peal and Lambert (1962) highlighted some of the cognitive benefits of bilingual education, including the bilingual child's ability to more readily transfer knowledge to tasks and concepts than monolingual children. Bilingual children have also been found to have improved English reading comprehension skills. The study by Carlisle and colleagues (1999) explored the relationship between vocabulary and early reading for 57 Spanish-English bilingual children in grades 1-3. The children were tested in both languages, and the researchers found that

vocabulary knowledge in Spanish helped to predict reading comprehension in English. This study corroborated an earlier large-scale longitudinal study by Ramírez and colleagues (1991) which found that kindergarten students in the late exit bilingual programs, where children's home languages were used for five to six years, outperformed the other students in different bilingual education models in English reading by sixth grade.

Elementary and middle school-age bilingual children who learned English alongside their native language have also been found to have advanced math and overall language arts skills over children in other bilingual education models. The Lindholm-Leary (2001) study found that bilingual students who learned English in the 90:10 model where students began 90% of instruction in their home language and 10% in the other language fared just as well on English proficiency tests as students who learned in a 50:50 dual language program. However, by sixth grade, the students in the dual language programs outperformed transitional bilingual education students (which favors learning English as quickly as possible) in English proficiency and in math.

A more recent study by Valentino and Reardon (2014) corroborated the findings of the academic benefits of dual language education models. Valentino and Reardon (2014) investigated the differences in academic achievement from kindergarten through middle school among English language learners. Data included a sample of 13,750 EBL students followed over nine years in a large urban district. The EBL students attended four different types of programs—English immersion, transitional bilingual, developmental bilingual, and dual immersion programs—for speakers of Spanish and Mandarin Chinese. The authors found that the English Language Arts scores of students in all the bilingual programs grew as fast or faster

than those of children in English immersion, indicating that there was no significant difference among the bilingual programs in terms of their support for both groups.

2.5.3 Cognitive benefits of bilingualism for young children

Emergent bilingual learners between two and eight-years-old develop their abilities to understand, use, and manipulate the structures of each language both verbally and in writing (Soderman, 2010). Young EBLs are able to produce the "naturalistic prosody and phonology, the music and rhythms unique to particular languages," and they develop the "dental/lingual/labial shapes" to produce the accurate sounds (Soderman, 2010, p. 58). Research has shown that EBL children often outperform their monolingual English-speaking peers in math, since learning a second language uses similar cognitive functioning required in problem solving (Abbot et al., 2007). EBL children also demonstrate greater metalinguistic understanding (Bialystok et al., 2014), communication (Fan et al., 2015), executive function skills (Bialystok et al., 2010; Yang et al., 2011), and social-emotional skills (Han & Huang, 2010; Luchtel et al., 2010). Evidently, young children can be bilingual without being developmentally delayed in language, debunking the misconception that language acquisition suffers when a second language is introduced (Pettito & Kovelman, 2003). Psychologist Janet Werker (2012), who studies language acquisition in bilingual babies, affirms that there is absolutely no evidence that learning two languages leads to delay or confusion.

2.5.4 Ideological and policy support for English-only argument

While there is ample research in support of dual language instruction in PreK through grade 12, there is little research arguing the other side of the coin—that English-only (English immersion) instruction is more beneficial. Alas, the English-only model, backed by sparse concrete evidence, has been the de facto model for instructing non-monolingual English

speaking students. Many continue to erroneously believe that teaching children to read in an additional language may serve as a risk factor for reading difficulties (Snow et al., 1998). In fact, one argument for English-only instruction in schools is the belief that spending classroom time with maximum exposure to the English language will result in faster English language acquisition (Baker, 1998; Porter, 1990; Rossell & Baker, 1996). This belief, however, has not been proven.

The argument in favor of an English-only model of education is based on small pockets of evidence among K-12 students, including signs of success in California because test scores of EBL students increased significantly in the three years after the one-year English immersion program (Crawford & Krashen, 2007). Rather, advocates of the English-only model of instruction focus not on its efficacy but on the lack of evidence supporting the competing bilingual education model. Indeed, advocates promoting the English-only model argue that bilingual education is a "failed experiment" (Tamayo et al., 2002). They argue that many students who went through the bilingual education system never learned to read, write or even speak English properly. Research evaluations suggest that the bilingual education program model for students learning English as a second language was not more effective than the established English-only model. In this study, the American Institutes for Research (AIR) (1977) conducted a national evaluation of 38 bilingual programs, comparing the pre and posttest academic performance of Spanish speaking students enrolled in bilingual education, and Spanish-speaking students enrolled in English-only mainstream classrooms. The study reported that the bilingual programs were not more effective than English-only classes or ESL (Danoff, 1978). Another early report by Baker and de Kanter in 1983 explored 28 evaluation studies of bilingual education, concluding that students in bilingual education programs did not outperform students

who were not in bilingual education programs (Hakuta & Mostafapour, 1996). While the bias in these studies has come into question (many students in the AIR study were formerly enrolled in bilingual programs), the case for English-only has often been synonymous with the case against bilingual programs (Hakuta & Mostafapour, 1996).

2.6 Teachers of Emergent Bilingual Learners

2.6.1 The influence of teachers' attitudes and misconceptions towards EBLs

Just as Vygotsky (1978) notes that sociocultural backgrounds and experiences influence learning and development, teachers' backgrounds and experiences affect how they view their pedagogy, how they view their students, and how students learn. Teachers can imbue their biases into their instructional methods when they do not share or understand the cultural or linguistic background of a child in his or her classroom (Espinosa & López, 2007) and/or when they do not recognize their ways of communicating, their cultural practices, and beliefs as cultural (Souto-Manning, 2013). Furthermore, teachers' attitudes and beliefs intrinsically impact their perception of their students (Flores & Smith, 2008). As substantiated by a wealth of research, a teacher's behavior, actions, and underlying belief and value system dramatically impacts student learning in the early childhood classroom (Atencio, 2012; Collinson et al., 1998; Eberly et al., 2007).

Teachers can have lower expectations of their EBL students, which dramatically alter what and how they teach. Haberman (1991) found that teachers in diverse schools sometimes have lower expectations for their students' success, leading to a "pedagogy of poverty" that is overly directive and thwarts the unrealized possibilities for students' deep and complex learning. Often, teachers erroneously and unfairly equate English abilities with cognitive functioning. Ruiz (1995) coins this orientation "language as problem," where a student's low language proficiency is erroneously equated with cognitive limitations.

EBLs are disproportionately overrepresented in special education services, far outnumbering the referrals submitted for monolingual English speaking students, a fact that suggests teachers may be unable to distinguish between language and cognitive development (Rueda & Stillman, 2012). Flores and Smith (2008) found that teachers generally believe that students' "lack of English and the lack of exclusive attention to mainstream culture in the curriculum may engender ignorance and decreased learning potentialities" (p. 340). Valenzuela (1999) and Weisman and Garza (2002) found that teachers attributed the achievement gap solely to the individual, indicating the powerful beliefs surrounding the individual and meritocracy, often at the exclusion of outside institutional forces, that are deeply embedded within teachers' ideologies.

Further studies offer more evidence for teacher-held beliefs equating limited English proficiency with limited cognitive abilities. Edl and colleagues (2008) analyzed teachers' reports of student's academic and social success and found that students' level of language proficiency strongly influenced the teacher's views of those students as low achievers. When teachers were asked to rate their students on characteristics related to academic ability, popularity, and aggression, the researchers found that teachers rated Latinx EBLs lower than other Latinxs who were English proficient (Edl et al., 2008). In their 2006 study, Pacini-Ketchabaw and Armstrong de Almeida (2006) collected data from immigrant families in Canada and found that many educators saw EBL children as an obstacle to accomplishing their instructional goals, perceiving children's bilingualism as a handicap (Pacini-Ketchabaw & Armstrong de Almeida, 2006). Finally, Vázquez-Montilla et al. (2014) attempted to uncover teacher feelings towards working with linguistically minoritized students and found that 88% of participants reported agreement with the statement that "having a non—or limited English proficient student in the classroom is

detrimental to the learning of other students" (p. 582). The studies highlight both the widespread misconceptions as well as the general sentiments regarding EBLs, and their influence on teachers' perceptions of instructional accomplishments of others.

2.6.2 Preschool teachers' preparation for and professional knowledge of language and cultural diversity

2.6.2.1 Lack of adequately-prepared teachers of EBLs

Research has shown that many teachers lack preparation in oral language development, academic language, and cultural diversity and inclusivity, and therefore do not feel prepared to teach emergent bilingual learners (Ballantyne et al., 2008; Samson & Collins, 2012). According to Whitebook (2014), the increasing student diversity in early childhood classrooms in particular necessitates changes in teacher preparation and education to ensure that teachers can meet the needs of their linguistically minoritized students. This need is corroborated by teacher sentiments regarding preparedness for teaching a linguistically minoritized student body, as well as by research highlighting teacher education in the early childhood sector.

Teachers who lack preparation in bilingual education are more likely to hold a deficit perspective of emergent bilingual learners (Baecher et al., 2013; Gándara et al., 2005). Whitebook and colleagues (2009) found that early childhood teacher educators, policy administrators, and ECE researchers felt that higher education teacher preparation programs should provide stronger teacher education in the areas of poverty and diversity, and particularly focus on working with young EBLs. One interviewee expressed: "We're not preparing teachers to deal with English Language Learners. When I'm out in the field, or talking with trainers who deal with these issues, I'm hearing that ECE students and teachers just don't know about language development in general" (p. 6).

Other studies have echoed the findings that teachers working with EBLs have reported a lack of knowledge on how to offer additional supports, citing a dearth of resources available to them in working with EBLs (Daniel & Friedman, 2005; Fletcher et al., 1999; Ray & Bowman, 2003). A 2004 survey of 689 New Jersey preschool teachers working in state-funded preschool found that over half of the teachers reported needing additional preparation to work with EBL children (Ryan et al., 2004). Likewise, a 2006 survey of more than 1,200 teachers found that 57% reported that they needed more information to work effectively with culturally and linguistically diverse students (Reeves, 2006).

Many studies found teachers of PreK through grade 8 children were frustrated with the lack of resources and education devoted to teaching their EBL students. Helfrich and Bean's (2011) study of kindergarten through grade eight elementary teacher education programs found that the teachers reported a perceived weakness in their ability to adapt their teaching of reading to meet the needs of English language learners, and they felt unprepared in their education to successfully perform this task. While the study indicated that teachers felt they had received some instruction on working with linguistically diverse learners, it was simply insufficient and ill-equipped them for the instructional demands in their own classrooms. Another study by Bernhard and Pacini-Ketchabaw (2010), referencing the research of Pacini-Ketchabaw and Armstrong de Almeida (2006), found that there was a disconnect between the early childhood educators' explicit voicing of support for children's bilingualism, on the one hand, and their inability to act in support of their growth, on the other hand. Their research highlighted that early childhood educators felt that they lacked resources to teach young EBL children and struggled to communicate with non-English speaking parents (Pacini-Ketchabaw & Armstrong de Almeida, 2006). Yet another study conducted by Buysse et al. (2004) distributed a national survey to 117

state administrators of early childhood programs in order to examine perceptions of challenges and strategies for serving Latinx children and families and found that the majority reported that their programs lacked sufficiently prepared staff.

2.6.2.2 Importance of pre-service linguistic diversity education on influencing teachers' beliefs

Teacher education can have positive effects on linguistically minoritized students' learning (Whitebook, 2014). A teacher's preparation and professional knowledge in working with children with linguistic diversities affects their perception of linguistically minoritized students in the classroom setting. Linguistic diversity education helps teachers to be more understanding, sensitive, and accommodating to their linguistically minoritized students. Studies that looked at teacher perceptions before and after pre-service diversity education attest to the influence of teacher education (Bodur, 2012; Torok & Aguilar, 2000; Walker-Dalhouse & Dalhouse, 2006). Many studies have found that the lack of formal preparation in linguistic competency inhibits an early educator's ability to effectively utilize strategies that engage children of all linguistic backgrounds (Buysse et al., 2005; García & Gonzales, 2006).

Bodur (2012) conducted a survey with pre-service elementary education teachers to determine the extent to which their beliefs and attitudes change through their coursework in a multicultural teacher education course. Bodur found that teachers' attitudes differed significantly between those who had not completed the course and those who had; notably, students who had not completed the course explained the poor performance of linguistically minoritized students as outside of the teachers' control, whereas those who had completed the course believed that teachers could act upon this issue. Students who had not completed the course cited language barriers and lack of parental care and attention at home, which Bodur (2012) describes as "stock answers," whereas the students who had completed the course cited low teacher expectations,

insufficient resources in the schools, and conflict between school and home culture, indicating growth in one's perceptions towards linguistically minoritized students and the ability to understand the broader educational system.

Another study conducted by Torok and Aguilar (2000) explored whether a pre-service teacher multicultural education course could change student-teachers' beliefs and knowledge about language issues. The authors found that student-teachers' beliefs about language were generally more accepting after having completed the course; for example, students were increasingly aware of their own beliefs, and expressed more open beliefs about diversity, increased multicultural knowledge, and increased knowledge and beliefs about language issues (Torok & Aguilar, 2000). Students also shifted from reporting minimal to no knowledge of language issues and programs at the beginning of the course, to average knowledge by the end of the course (Torok & Aguilar, 2000). This study holds implications for strengthening the quality of multicultural pre-service teacher educator courses, suggesting that they can influence and change teachers' attitudes and beliefs towards language diversity. A similar study by Walker-Dalhouse and Dalhouse (2006) analyzed the survey responses from pre-service teachers before and after attending a diversity practicum and seminar. The authors found that pre-service teachers who had completed the course would be less likely to refer students for testing if they thought that their students' perceived learning difficulties were due to linguistic differences.

2.6.2.3 Characteristics of well-prepared teachers of EBLs and the need to better understand them

There is a startling lack of research pinpointing the most essential characteristics of well-prepared teachers and administrators of EBL students. According to the Center for American Progress April 2012 report, little attention has been paid to the critical knowledge and skills that

teachers must possess in order to effectively teach emergent bilingual learner students in their classrooms. Amidst debates over English immersion versus bilingual strategies, teacher education has emerged as one of the most urgent issues in the field. Goldenberg (2013) writes that "it is an inconvenient truth: we lack the knowledge base to fully prepare teachers to help many of their English learner and language-minority students" (p. 11). Despite exposure to the benefits of new models of curriculum or instructional tools, some teachers comply on a "purely superficial level" indicating a misalignment between administration requirements and knowledge of how to use the new tools and practices (Torok & Aguilar, 2000, p. 24). Additionally, most public school administrators also lack educational experiences in bilingual education, despite the key role they play in supporting equitable education for emergent bilingual learners (Leithwood et al., 2005).

The small existing research on supporting teachers of students learning a second language highlights effective teaching characteristics and strategies. For example, studies found that effective teachers of emergent bilingual learners view students' background knowledge, such as home language and culture, as a resource from which to build knowledge and identities and foster metacognitive and metalinguistic abilities (Ladson-Billings, 2001; Larsen-Freeman & Goldenberg, 2015; Larsen-Freeman et al., 2015). These teachers build scaffolds appropriate to specific tasks and to emergent bilingual learners' cognitive and linguistic needs, supporting them in classroom discussion and written texts (García & Walqui, 2015; Velasco & Kibler, 2015).

The study by Vaughn and colleagues (2006) cited the importance of making connections between a first grade student's knowledge in their native language and its application to English. The study concluded that teachers should provide ample opportunities for students to practice oral language in both languages in high-order questions and responses and should engage

students in building their vocabulary in both languages (Vaughn et al., 2006). Likewise, the study highlighted specific research-based principles for teaching reading in English for EBLs based on similarities with a child's native language.

Further, Villegas and Lucas (2002) identify culturally responsive teaching as being socioculturally conscious, possessing positive views of minoritized students, feeling responsible for educational change, understanding how students learn and construct knowledge, knowing about their student's lives, and instructing students according to what they already know. In particular, they note that teachers must possess an affirming attitude towards students from culturally and linguistically minoritized backgrounds, acknowledging that students who are learning English as a second language possess a great deal of knowledge that should be supported (Villegas & Lucas, 2002).

Finally, the existing research focuses on dispelling misconceptions shared by many teachers of emergent bilingual learners. Sanchez (2011) distributed the Language and Culture Questionnaire to PreK teachers in Florida who worked with EBL students. Most teachers (90%) believed that learning an additional language for a child was a simple and short process. While a majority of teachers (88%) agreed that everyone in the school should understand how children learn a language, more than half the teachers (57%) also believed that the process of learning English is the same for all children, regardless of other languages they might speak. While 96% of teachers believed that parents should speak their native language with their children, 30% thought parents of EBLs should speak English at home as well, which may reflect the common misconception that speaking other languages present an obstacle to learning English in school and to academic development in general.

2.6.2.4 Curriculum and degree requirements ignore linguistic diversity preparation for teachers and leaders

Where there is some emphasis on linguistic diversity education, it is compromised in quality and scope. With regard to quality, researchers Maxwell and colleagues (2006) found that university-based teacher education programs were leaving graduates wholly unprepared to teach a linguistically minoritized group of children. Programs often examine literacy development in one language, overlooking biliteracy and the nuances of dual language acquisition. Little attention has been given as to how teacher preparation programs address children's diverse characteristics, including their race, culture, language, ethnicity, and special needs (Miller et al., 2002). There is also the belief, shared by some in the ECE field, that only a teacher fluent in the native language of his or her EBL student can effectively teach that child (Gándara & Maxwell-Jolly, 2006).

A glimpse into the graduation requirements for students in early childhood education pre-service programs reveals an absence of formal linguistic diversity preparation (Villegas & Lucas, 2002). A national study of early childhood teacher preparation found that working with bilingual children was the least likely content area to be required as part of a practicum for any degree program (Maxwell et al., 2006). Less than 15% of programs offering a Bachelor's degree or Associate's degree required an entire course or more on working with bilingual children. A 2006 study on the ECE workforce found that, among those interviewed, only 15% of early childhood teachers who completed college coursework took classes on linguistic diversity (Whitebook et al., 2006). Not surprisingly, bilingual early childhood teachers were found to be more likely to have participated in linguistic diversity coursework than teachers who spoke only English (Whitebook et al., 2006).

NAEYC underscores the importance of leaders knowing about children and their families' diverse needs and characteristics in ECE teacher preparation programs. Several studies suggest that school leaders should receive preparation for working with emergent bilingual learners, since they are responsible for articulating their school's policies on emergent bilingual learners to school staff and teachers, modeling the behaviors and attitudes that they expect teachers to adopt, and ensuring that staff have teacher education which attends to the needs of EBLs (Hill & Flynn, 2004; Horwitz et al., 2009; Tung et al., 2011).

2.6.2.5 In-service teacher education regarding standards and their implementation

While much has been written about the development of early learning and development standards by states, "little is known about how the early learning standards are used to train early childhood practitioners and ultimately how these practitioners use the standards in their day-to-day practice" (Shaffer, 2013, p. 7). Indeed, according to Tout and colleagues (2013), "the best designed early learning standards will have minimal impact on children's success unless they are incorporated into the early childhood professional development system and program curriculum and assessment practices" (p. 38). It has become clear that both appropriate preparation as well as technical assistance for teachers to implement state standards is of critical importance (Morris et al., 2009).

Teacher education is essential for early childhood practitioners to effectively and appropriately embed early learning and development standards into their lesson plans and daily practice (Kagan et al., 2005; Scott-Little, 2006; Scott-Little et al., 2003; Shepard et al., 1996). Providing focused education for teachers that target strategies to facilitate children's learning and skill development can support the implementation of standards in ways that foundationally honor bilingual children (Shaffer, 2013). Adequately identifying the resources and supports that early

childhood practitioners need to effectively implement state standards can impact research and funding for standards implementation (Shaffer, 2013). Additionally, well-developed alignment processes, where collaboration between teachers occurs both horizontally—across early childhood classrooms—and vertically—among primary school-age classrooms, are proving more critical to ensuring young children's success as they move from preschool to kindergarten and later years. Horizontal alignment refers to the consistency of standards, curriculum, and assessment within a given age group, and vertical alignment refers to the synchronization of standards, curriculum, and assessment between age groups (Scott-Little & Reid, 2010). States are moving to align their preschool learning standards with earlier years and the elementary grades to create a developmental learning continuum for children (Kagan & Tarrant, 2010). The alignment of standards between the early childhood and K-12 system is believed to lead to student academic success, reduced special education costs, and a more highly skilled and competent workforce (Tout et al., 2013).

States have implemented teacher education for the implementation of ELDS in early childhood. Scott-Little and colleagues (2007) conducted a study that documented and analyzed these trends and found that states use a variety of mechanisms to ensure effective implementation of ELDS in the Pre-K classroom. States provided in-service preparation and technical assistance to programs through conferences, train-the-trainer models, and in-service education directly to program staff. The preparation also emphasized linking standards to curricula and assessments, as well as using standards with children with disabilities and, significant to this paper, EBLs. Professional development sessions across the states ranged from one hour long to year-long courses, with several states offering college credit in exchange for participation.

Implementing ELDS in the early childhood classroom requires adequately prepared teachers in ELDS. However, early childhood professionals receive very little guidance or education on implementing standards, leaving educators to "decide for themselves what is important and what can be left out" (Flores et al., 2016, p. 149). The study by Scott-Little and colleagues (2006) found that many early childhood teachers who received ongoing professional support on the content of ELDS and how to integrate ELDS with their practice felt that standards helped with their curriculum planning and validated and strengthened their teaching practice (Scott-Little, 2006). Another study by Katz and colleagues (2010), in a study of early childhood educators, found that professional development modules that emphasized how to incorporate diversity and culture within each standard and how to design lessons for all students greatly helped teachers. However, some teacher participants were unable to apply certain standards in their classroom, which might suggest a "barrier or a lack of understanding of the specific social studies standard, benchmark or indicator" (Katz et al., 2010, p. 227).

The literature on teacher education and professional development for standards implementation in early childhood education begs to be further explored. While some of the highlighted studies touch upon a link between teacher education for standards implementation and attitudes, there is still a need for more comprehensive and focused research on the multifaceted topic of teacher education on standards. Indeed, the impetus for this study is framed by the lack of literature focusing on perception of teacher education on standards as well as literature highlighting how teachers make sense of standards documents in order to apply them to their classroom, specifically for EBL students.

In summary, the literature indicates that early childhood teachers need improved pre-service linguistic diversity education as well as improved in-service education on standards and

their implementation in order to effectively teach EBL students. Preparation in linguistic diversity can have positive effects on students' learning, and support teachers' ability to be understanding, sensitive, and accommodating to the needs of linguistically minoritized students. Conversely, a lack of preparation results in teachers holding a deficit perspective of EBLs and a lack of knowledge of how to offer supports to EBLs. Despite this evidence, many university-based early childhood teacher education programs are not adequately preparing graduates to teach linguistically minoritized learners. For in-service early childhood teachers, their professional development opportunities in understanding and implementing ELDS are likewise limited in scope.

This literature review explores the existing research in the areas of ELDS, early childhood education for EBLs, as well as the historical, theoretical, and sociopolitical context surrounding EBLs. Drawing on Vygotsky and Rogoff's sociocultural theories in order to better understand child learning, the literature review explores the history of ELDS, cultural variation and standards, the history of EBLs in the U.S., the historical and sociopolitical framework for bilingual education, Question 2, and teacher education and attitudes regarding ELDS and linguistic and cultural diversity in early childhood. The study adds to the literature through an exploration of the interplay between ELDS and EBLs in PreK classrooms. By asking about perceptions and attitudes of teachers and policy experts regarding ELDS in the research questions, the study hopes to contextualize ELDS within a sociocultural framework in order to provide an understanding of the role of standards in the early education of EBLs.

Chapter III – METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction and Theoretical Frame

This qualitative study adopts a sociocultural framework for understanding the data collected within different preschool program types in the Boston public school system. It is fitting to conduct the research through a sociocultural theoretical lens as this approach acknowledges, supports, and empowers diversity in the classroom setting. Sociocultural theories of learning contend that language and culture play a central role in children's development. Specifically, the study emphasizes the positive aspects of linguistic and cultural diversity, citing sources that suggest second language learning is additive and beneficial, rather than an obstacle to learning. Accordingly, native language instruction and cultural capital is understood as playing a critical role in EBLs' learning acquisition.

As such, this research adopts a Vygotskian approach for studying ELDS and their relationship to young EBL students that gives value to individual context and sociocultural circumstances. Vygotsky's perspective viewed learning and development occurring in socially and culturally shaped contexts, and he advocated for examining change by studying changing historical conditions. Using Vygotsky's understanding of culturally-mediated change and the importance of examining historical context, this study explores the perceptions of the nexus between ELDS and EBLs' experiences and the history of the changing language policies that characterize early childhood education in Massachusetts.

First, the research explores how and to what extent EBLs are accounted for in 11 sets of Massachusetts ELDS documents. Vygotsky's sociocultural theory of learning affirms that language and culture play a central role in children's development. In analyzing the written standards documents, this theory helps to understand the extent to which EBL children's learning

and development must be understood within their greater sociohistorical context. Likewise, Rogoff's emphasis on culture is used to analyze the extent to which standards documents view EBL children's learning within their cultural context.

Second, the research explores how preschool teachers in different BPS program types (general education, SEI, DLL) perceive the relationships between Massachusetts language policy, ELDS, and the needs of their young EBL students. Additionally, the study seeks to understand the extent to which preschool teachers in different BPS program types report utilizing ELDS to scaffold the learning and development of EBLs. Through qualitative interviews with teachers, Vygotsky's sociocultural theory of learning is used to understand the extent to which teachers use (and have been prepared to use) ELDS to scaffold student learning for EBLs. Rogoff's emphasis on culture is used to understand child learning within its cultural context, providing a lens through which to understand teachers' perceptions of the utility of standards for EBLs. Vygotsky's emphasis on the inextricable link between language and culture is used to understand to what extent teachers report using ELDS differently for EBLs and English-dominant children. Vygotsky's emphasis on language as an essential tool for communication and cognitive development, coupled with Rogoff's emphasis on learning as unique to one's cultural context, is used to understand the extent to which teachers reportedly address language acquisition and cultural diversity in their instruction.

Finally, the research explores how state and district level education policy experts perceive the relationships between Massachusetts language policy, ELDS, and the needs of young EBL students. Through qualitative interviews with policy experts, Rogoff's emphasis on culture is used to understand child learning within its context, providing a lens through which to better understand policy experts' perceptions of standards for EBLs. As Rogoff understands

developmental benchmarks as Eurocentric, her approach is used to understand the extent to which policy is built upon the practices of the cultural community of the majority. Rogoff highlights the ways in which language, culture, and the broader educational policy which encompass it can influence child learning in preschool settings. Vygotsky and Rogoff together provide a strong theoretical perspective on child learning and development that can inform and frame a qualitative research design that is strongly rooted in exploring and illuminating individual voice and agency.

3.2 Research Questions

1. How are EBLs positioned in written ECE Massachusetts' standards documents and guidelines?
2. How do preschool teachers across different Boston public preschool program types (general education, SEI, dual language) perceive the relationships between Massachusetts language policy, ELDS, and the needs of their young EBL students?
3. How do preschool teachers across different Boston public preschool program types (general education, SEI, dual language) report utilizing ELDS to scaffold the learning and development of EBLs:
    a. How do they convey their general attitudes and perceptions regarding using ELDS?
    b. How do they report having been prepared to use ELDS in their instruction, both generally and specifically for EBLs?
    c. How do they report using ELDS in their instruction?
    d. How do they report using ELDS to address language acquisition and cultural diversity?

4. How do state and district level education policy experts perceive the relationships between Massachusetts language policy, ELDS, and the needs of young EBL students?

Table 1. Research Question Alignment with Theories and Methodology

Research Questions	Theories	Methodology
RQ 1. How are EBLs positioned in written ECE Massachusetts' standards documents and guidelines?	Vygotsky's sociocultural theory of learning affirms that language and culture play a central role in children's development. In analyzing the written standards documents, this theory helps to understand the extent to which EBL children's learning and development must be understood within their greater sociohistorical context. Likewise, Rogoff's emphasis on culture is used to analyze the extent to which standards documents view EBL children's learning within their cultural context.	Document Review of 11 Sets of Massachusetts ECE Standards Documents
RQ 2. How do preschool teachers across different Boston public preschool program types (general education, SEI, DLL) perceive the relationships between Massachusetts' language policy, ELDS, and the needs of their young EBL students?	Vygotsky's sociocultural theory of learning is used to understand the ways in which teachers report scaffolding within an EBL child's ZPD. Rogoff's emphasis on culture is used to understand child learning within its cultural context, providing a lens through which to understand teachers' perceptions of the utility of standards for EBLs.	Qualitative interview data on how preschool teachers perceive the relationships between Massachusetts language policy, ELDS, and the needs of young EBL students.
RQ 3. How do preschool teachers across different Boston public preschool program types (general education, SEI, DLL) report utilizing ELDS to scaffold the learning and development of EBLs: a. How do they convey their general attitudes and perceptions regarding using ELDS? b. How do they report having been prepared to use ELDS in their instruction, both generally and specifically for EBLs?	Vygotsky's theory of scaffolding, where teachers build upon a child's preexisting knowledge, is used to understand the extent to which teachers use (and have been prepared to use) ELDS to scaffold student learning, in general and for EBLs. Vygotsky's emphasis on language as an essential tool for communication and cognitive development, coupled with Rogoff's emphasis on learning as unique to one's cultural context, is used to understand the extent to which teachers reportedly address language acquisition and cultural diversity in their instruction. Vygotsky's emphasis on the inextricable link between language and culture is used to understand to what extent teachers report using ELDS differently for EBLs and English-dominant children.	Qualitative interview data on how preschool teachers perceive the relationships between Massachusetts language policy, ELDS, and the needs of young EBL students.

c. How do they report using ELDS in their instruction? d. How do they report using ELDS to address language acquisition and cultural diversity?		
RQ 4. How do state and district level education policy experts perceive the relationships between Massachusetts language policy, ELDS, and the needs of young EBL students?	Rogoff's emphasis on culture is used to understand child learning within its context, providing a lens through which to better understand policy experts' perceptions of standards for EBLs. As Rogoff understands developmental benchmarks as a culturally-specific practice unique to the Euro-American culture, her approach is used to understand the extent to which policy is built upon the practices of the cultural community of the majority. Rogoff highlights the ways in which language, culture, and the broader educational policy which encompass it can influence child learning in preschool settings.	Qualitative interview data on how state and district level education policy experts perceive the relationships between Massachusetts language policy, ELDS, and the needs of young EBL students.

3.3 Participant Selection

Participants were recruited through purposeful sampling and snowball sampling. Purposeful sampling was used for state and city selection, school site selection, and teacher selection. Snowball sampling was used for policy expert selection.

3.3.1 State and city selection

Using purposeful sampling, I selected Massachusetts as the state where I conducted my research—and Boston as the city—based on pre-selected criteria that followed from my research questions. Specifically, my study required a locale with a large EBL population, a robust public preschool program that provided a variety of program types for EBLs (general education, SEI, DLL), and a restrictive language policy climate.

Massachusetts, with an immigrant population of 16%, (American Immigration Council, 2017) is one of only seven states that experienced over 200% increase in the number of English language learners between 2004 and 2012 (U.S. Department of Education, 2015)—an indication of a large and growing EBL population in the state. Boston has the seventh highest share of immigrants among 25 peer U.S. cities (The Boston Planning & Development Agency, 2018), making it a wise choice for the city where my research took place. Important to note, within the Boston public schools, 30% of the student population is classified as EBL and 47% speak a language other than English as their first language (Boston Redevelopment Authority, 2015; Vaznis, 2015).

Moreover, there is a wealth of pre-existing data on the positive effects of the public PreK program in Boston public schools, known as K1. These data, which indicate that despite the positive effects there is still a great achievement gap for EBL students, provide a reference for my own research with EBL students in similar Boston K1 classrooms. A 2014 analysis of the DIBELS assessment, used by Boston to measure a child's readiness for reading, found that all students who attended Boston's K1 preschool program scored substantially higher on the reading assessment than students who were new to BPS. In particular, Latinx students who participated in Boston's preschool program made enormous strides in meeting kindergarten benchmarks (Boston Public Schools, Office of Data and Accountability, 2014). Not only did all students of every ethnicity who were enrolled in the K1 program outperform students in reading who did not participate in K1, but 70% of Latinx students who were enrolled in a BPS K1 class reached benchmark levels (suggesting a high probability of achieving subsequent reading goals) upon entering kindergarten, compared to 39% of Latinx students who reached benchmark levels and were not enrolled in BPS K1. Despite these successes, Latinx students achieved lower reading

scores than the Asian, White, and African American students. Indeed, according to the Massachusetts Association of Teachers of Speakers of Other Languages (MATSOL) (2009), emergent bilingual learners are the lowest performing subgroup in the state by every measure.

Additionally, I selected Massachusetts because it is a situated representation of restrictive language policy through Question 2, which banned bilingual education in 2002. Question 2 replaced transitional bilingual education programs with sheltered English immersion classrooms, where native language use is discouraged and academic content is taught exclusively in English. Boston, an urban city and the capital of Massachusetts, has endured a lawsuit based on the restrictions imposed by Question 2 firsthand. Federal authorities found that, since the passing of Question 2, Boston schools have failed to adequately teach its EBLs (Mitchell, 2015; Vaznis, 2015). According to federal authorities in a 2010 United States Department of Justice lawsuit against Boston Public Schools, nearly half of all English learners in Boston schools do not receive enough or any specialized instruction (Boston Globe, 2015; U.S. Department of Education, 2010). The political climate of Boston compels further research on the EBL student experience in the early childhood classroom.

3.3.2 School selection

3.3.2.1 Rationale behind the sites

Using a maximum variation sampling design—a type of purposeful sampling—I used six Boston public school (BPS) preschool sites, known citywide as K1, to conduct my research. Maximum variation sampling allowed for the documentation of diverse sites that varied along the criteria of program type (general education, SEI, DLL), enabling me to capture a range of pedagogical approaches within the early childhood system. The nature of the BPS K1 programs varies within the BPS diverse delivery system. Given the variations between program types, I

chose to stratify the sample of K1 sites by three program types (general education, SEI, DLL), since the nature of the programs themselves vary. Most BPS K1 programs offer a general education classroom, which includes children from all backgrounds, including monolingual English speakers alongside those learning English. In general education classes, teachers are not typically prepared in ESOL or bilingual education (Ballantyne et al., 2008) and the language of instruction is English.

Other K1 programs offer language specific or multilingual sheltered English immersion (SEI) classrooms, which are English-language classrooms that combine English as a Second Language methods, such as bilingual aides, adapted texts, and visual aids, with academic content. Students in SEI classrooms are instructed in English, and they are typically, but not always, in the same classrooms as monolingual English speakers, and teachers hold an SEI teacher endorsement. Since the passing of Question 2 in 2002, SEI classrooms have replaced transitional bilingual education as an instructional model. Transitional bilingual education programs previously instructed children in their native languages in order to support their transition into English-only classrooms as quickly as possible.

Some K1 programs offer a dual language learner model (DLL), which is a type of enrichment immersion that aims to leverage children's linguistic and cultural knowledge and experiences (Thomas & Collier, 1998). Dual language learner programs gradually introduce instruction in the majority language so that students increasingly master academic proficiency in both languages. Dual language programs in BPS are also known as two-way immersion programs. Program models are 90/10 (full immersion, where 90% of instruction is in the partner language), 70/30 (modified immersion, where 70% of instruction is in the partner language), or 50/50 (partial immersion, where instruction is divided evenly between two languages) (Diez &

Karp, 2013). The DLL programs I identified for this study are two-way English and Spanish bilingual schools, where non-native Spanish speakers and native Spanish speakers are integrated in the classroom. Beginning with a 90/10 model in K1, all students in the K1 classes learn to read and write in the partner language first (Spanish), with one block of English language development instructional time.

3.3.2.2 Criteria for school site selection

In keeping with criterion sampling, and in order to study a range of program types through a maximum variation sampling design, six school sites were chosen for the study. First, all of the school sites were located in neighborhoods comprising at least 20% of residents who spoke a language other than English in their homes, as determined by local census data, in order to represent schools with a linguistically diverse demographic. Neighborhoods such as East Boston, Jamaica Plain, Roslindale, Dorchester, Roxbury, Chinatown, Hyde Park, and Allston/Brighton have become increasingly linguistically diverse, with at least one to ten percent of the population in every Boston neighborhood comprised of multilingual speakers (Boston Redevelopment Authority, 2015). The preschools were located in East Boston, Roxbury, South Boston, and the South End, consistent with the established criteria that schools must be located in neighborhoods where at least 20% of residents speak a language other than English in their homes (Boston Indicators, 2017; Boston Redevelopment Authority, 2015).

Second, because I was interested in examining variations in the perceptions and utility of ELDS by three program types (general education, SEI, DLL), the six schools included two in each of the three categories. Two of the school sites had SEI preschool classrooms, two school sites had general education preschool classrooms, and two school sites had dual language preschool classrooms. If there were differences in the reported perceptions of ELDS across

program types, understanding the influencing factors behind these differences might offer insight into ways to support educators. A BPS ECE coach that I emailed connected me with two teachers (one general education and one SEI) who were willing to be interviewed, and two other schools (one general education and one SEI) were randomly selected from a list of BPS preschool programs according to their linguistically diverse location based on local census data. I determined the school sites with dual language classrooms by consulting with staff in the Boston public school ECE Central Office who aided me in making my selection. There were few dual language preschool classrooms in Boston (five dual language Spanish-English programs and one dual language Haitian Creole-English program) and therefore it was important to be guided by BPS staff based on their expert knowledge of which classrooms could be most easily accessed.

3.3.3 Teacher selection

I chose to identify lead teachers as my unit of analysis in K1 classrooms. I made the assumption, based on prior experience, that lead teachers would most likely have more relevant knowledge about early learning and development standards than would classroom paraprofessionals. Consequently, the lead teacher from each of the six classrooms was selected for the individual semi-structured interviews. I offered a $35 Amazon gift card to each interviewee as an act of appreciation. Interviews were conducted in the summer and fall of 2019, with the final interview conducted in winter 2020.

Six interviews were conducted with teachers: two in SEI PreK classrooms, two in general education PreK classrooms, and two in dual language PreK classrooms. Of the six teachers, one spoke Spanish as a second language (first language was English), a second teacher was a monolingual English speaker, and four teachers spoke English as a second or third language (two teachers spoke Spanish as a first language, a third teacher spoke Cape Verdean Creole and

Portuguese as first languages, and a fourth teacher spoke Russian and Spanish as first and second languages). Recruiting teachers for interviews proved to be more challenging than anticipated as several teachers did not respond to my emails, and one teacher did not want to be recorded. In these cases, I contacted the principal of the school to see if they could assist me in connecting with the teacher. The SEI teacher who did not want to be recorded opted out entirely, so I found another SEI teacher at a different school.

3.3.4 Policy expert selection

The research included six interviews in total with policy experts, with two individual in-person interviews with policy experts who worked at the Massachusetts Department of Early Education and Care (EEC), two individual in-person interviews with policy experts who worked at the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE), as well as two individual in-person interviews with policy experts who worked in the Boston Public Schools central office—one within the Department of Early Childhood and one within the Office of English Learners. These interviews fell within Hochschild's (2009) definition of "elite interviews" in that they were discussions with people who were chosen because of their position, as opposed to randomly or anonymously selected. Elite interviews provided helpful information regarding operational insight into the development and implementation of standards documents and the perceived influence of changing language policies on the teaching of EBLs.

The individuals chosen held positions in which they worked closely on early learning, ELDS design, administration, or policies for EBLs. The two EEC policy experts had a combined 35 years of experience at EEC, and held key positions in supporting educators, early care providers, and family engagement across the state. The two DESE policy experts similarly had a combined 30 years of experience at DESE, and held key positions in both supporting language

acquisition and early learning. The two BPS policy experts had a combined nearly 20 years of experience at BPS, and held key positions in both supporting EBLs and early learning. The specific positions—because of their uniquely identifying nature—are not disclosed here. The specific individuals at EEC and DESE came recommended by contacts in those offices. The individuals at BPS were selected through snowball sampling with guidance from state and district contacts familiar with the governance structure of BPS.

3.4. Data Collection Process

My study took place in four phases: document review; interviews with policy experts; interviews with teachers; data analysis. Each phase is briefly detailed below. Phase one consisted of a document review of Massachusetts early learning and development standards documents, and utilized content analysis to explore how and to what extent EBLs are accounted for in written ECE Massachusetts standards documents and guidelines. Phase two consisted of individual interviews with six policy experts: two education policy experts at the Massachusetts Department of Early Education and Care, two education policy experts at the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, and two at the Boston Public Schools central office. Phase three consisted of semi-structured individual interviews with six preschool teachers (one at each of the six school sites; two general education, two SEI, two DLL). Finally, phase four was the data analysis, consisting of a cross-interview analysis in which I compared, contrasted, and highlighted salient themes that emerged across the data.

Before beginning the study, the process of conducting interviews first began with obtaining clearance to speak with human subjects. I went through the Institutional Review Board (IRB) to obtain approval from Teachers College, Columbia University and BPS before contacting policy experts. This approval included permission to conduct interviews with selected

preschool teachers. It was also critical in my role as researcher to protect participants from harm and guarantee their privacy and consent (Merriam, 2009). I also distributed and received signed consent forms for all participants, which verified the intention of my research and informed participants of their rights. In conducting my interviews, I informed participants that I would censor the names of all individuals, places, and certain activities so as not to reveal personal or private information (Creswell, 2009). Additionally, I offered to share the findings from the research with participants if they requested this, and I provided my contact information so that the participants could contact me.

3.4.1 Phase 1: Document review

3.4.1.1 Purpose of the document review

The purpose of this analysis was to review Massachusetts' ELDS documents for preschool-age children (three to five years of age) to determine how EBLs are positioned, to identify approaches to meeting the needs of young EBLs, and to determine the extent to which the standards reflect the current scientific research on the learning and development of preschool-age EBLs. The document review illuminated the ways in which EBLs are represented and accounted for in a formal capacity. ELDS include expectations for what young children should know and be able to do. The literature review above indicates a need for ELDS that address the unique developmental characteristics and learning trajectories of EBLs. The document review was directly connected to the rest of the research, as it added potency and context to the interview aspect of the research, and helped solidify themes that could arise in the interviews. The document review also led me to think about my interview questions and probes.

3.4.1.2 Overview of chart composition

Table 2. ELDS Chart Composition

ELDS Document	Abbreviation	Year Developed/ Published	Prepared By	Age Span
1. MA Arts Curriculum Framework	ACF	1999	Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE)	By the end of grade 4
2. MA Foreign Languages	FL	1999	Massachusetts Department of Education	By the end of grade 4
3. MA Comprehensive Health Curriculum Framework	CHCF	1999	Massachusetts Department of Education	The end of grade 5
4. Guidelines for Preschool Learning Experiences	GPLE	2003	Massachusetts Department of Education	PreK-K
5. WIDA Early English Language Development Standards	WIDA	2014	EEC and the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction	2.5-5.5 Years
6. MA Standards for Preschool and Kindergarten: Social and Emotional Learning, and Approaches to Play and Learning	SELAPL	2015	EEC and DESE	Preschool and Kindergarten
7. MA Science and Technology/Engineering Curriculum Framework	STECF	2016	Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE)	Pre-K to Grade 8
8. MA English Language Arts and Literacy	ELAL	2017	Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education	PreKindergarten to 12

9. MA Curriculum Framework for Mathematics	CFM	2017	Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE)	PreKindergarten to 12
10. MA History and Social Science Curriculum Framework	HSSCF	2018	Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE)	Pre-Kindergarten to 12
11. Draft Guidelines for Preschool and Kindergarten Learning Experiences	GPKLE	2017-2018 Draft	EEC and DESE	Preschool and Kindergarten

3.4.1.3 Content of the Massachusetts ECE standards documents

Massachusetts has taken standards seriously and has developed eleven different standards documents, as described in the chart above. In order to analyze the current status of Massachusetts state ELDS in addressing EBLs, all eleven ELDS documents that represent the standards for preschool-age children in Massachusetts were reviewed. While some ELDS include standards for elementary-age children, only the standards for PreK were reviewed. These eleven documents included in the review are: 1) Guidelines for Preschool Learning Experiences (2003); 2) Guidelines for Preschool and Kindergarten Learning Experiences (Draft, 2017); 3) Massachusetts Standards for PreK and K: Social and Emotional Learning, and Approaches to Play and Learning (2015); 4) WIDA Early English Language Development Standards (2014); and 5) Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks. The Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks include the following documents: i) Massachusetts Arts Curriculum Framework (1999); ii) English Language Arts and Literacy (2017); iii) Foreign Languages (1999); iv) Massachusetts Comprehensive Health Curriculum Framework (1999); v) Massachusetts Curriculum Framework

for Mathematics (2017); vi) Massachusetts History and Social Science Curriculum Framework (2018); vii) Massachusetts Science and Technology/Engineering Framework (2016). These standards documents include benchmarks of student learning that consist of a wide range of domains, including but not limited to: Language and Literacy; Mathematics; English Language Arts; Science and Technology; History and Social Science; Social and Emotional Development; Motor and Physical Development; and Approaches to Play and Learning.

The documents are referred to with abbreviated acronyms, as listed in the chart above. ELDS are increasingly more inclusive of EBLs over time. Older ELDS that have yet to undergo revisions, including ACF, FL, MCHC, and GPLE, are less likely to reference EBLs in their introductions, language and literacy domains, other domains, and conclusions, as described in more detail below.

Understanding the origins and authority of the documents is important for locating the intentions, original purpose, and subjectivity/lens behind their creation. Three sets of standards—two from 1999 (FL and CHCF) and one from 2003 (GPLE)—were developed by the Massachusetts Department of Education, prior to the creation of the Massachusetts Department of Early Education and Care (EEC) in 2005. The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) developed the remaining MA curriculum frameworks, including those for Art, English Language Arts and Literacy, Mathematics, History and Social Science, and Science and Technology/Engineering. EEC worked collaboratively with DESE to develop the MA SELAPL, and the current draft of the GPKLE. EEC also worked collaboratively with the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction to develop the WIDA standards.

All the documents in this review were chosen because they include standards for preschool-age children. The age spans included are referred to as PreK-12, Preschool and

Kindergarten, or 2.5-5.5 years. The MA Technology Literacy Standards and Expectations (2008), renamed the MA Digital Literacy and Computer Science standards (2016), are excluded from this review as they do not include standards for preschool-age children. For some of the standards documents, it is difficult to distinguish standards for PreK and other grades, since the earliest indicators are for "by the end of grade 4" (i.e. ACF, FL) or "the end of grade 5" (CHCF) and therefore are not specific to PreK. These documents are included in this review as they are still applicable to preschool-age children, despite a clear distinction between ages/grades. The Massachusetts ECE standards documents represent the only state-specific indicators of child-based outcomes for four-year-old children used by Boston public PreK programs. The documents are made available to the public on the Internet, through the websites of the Massachusetts Department of Early Care and Education, the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, the Massachusetts Executive Office of Education, and WIDA.

3.4.1.4 Data coding of the documents

The data coding schema was guided by questions related to the authority and origins of the documents. Further, the coding was informed by content-related questions about how EBLs are positioned within the documents and the specific language these standards use to address EBLs, typically referred to as DLLs—dual language learners. Additionally, the documents vary considerably in organization, content, and nomenclature. The documents were classified in a coding schema using content analysis according to: a) the year they were developed or published b) who prepared them c) the age span addressed d) the nomenclature/terminology included that refers to EBLs e) whether they provide separate EBL guidelines f) whether they provide a separate EBL section within the guidelines g) whether EBLs are included in the introduction or

statement of philosophy h) whether EBLs are included in a language or literacy domain i) whether EBLs are included in other domains j) whether there is no mention of EBLs k) whether they include procedures for identifying EBLs (Espinosa & Calderón, 2015), and l) whether EBLs are included in the appendix or conclusion material. The categories of teacher qualifications, appropriate assessment, or instructional strategies—as identified by Espinosa and Calderón (2015)—are not included here, as the ELDS documents do not address these classifications.

Content analysis was used as a systematic way to detail the contents of the documents by relating categories and findings to each other and cataloguing the data in a coding schema to facilitate analysis. This method both quantitatively and qualitatively documented the variety and frequency of messages as well as the nature of the data (Merriam, 2009). After the initial categories were determined, content analysis involved analytical coding where the categories and findings were refined in a recursive process of ongoing analysis and interpretation of data. This process evolved based on how EBLs were represented. The categories were therefore flexible, allowing the coding schema and categories therein to be refocused. Subsequently, I revisited the documents and compared findings against the other ELDS. I further refined the categories and findings, while documenting the frequency and nature of occurrences within the ELDS. Through this iterative process, the categories of nomenclature and appendix/conclusion material were added as variations across the documents and each document was reviewed accordingly. The analysis also added an exploration of the extent to which EBL references were geared towards educator practices, student outcomes, or both educators and students. Categories were also influenced by the literature review on cultural variation and standards, with particular attention given to Espinosa and Calderón's (2015) study on ELDS and EBLs.

3.4.2 Phase 2: Interviews with policy experts

3.4.2.1 Purpose of the interviews with policy experts

Building on the document review, I conducted the second phase of data collection through six individual interviews with policy experts at EEC, DESE, and BPS. These audio-recorded interviews provided essential contextual support for better understanding the ways in which ELDS are positioned in early childhood education and perceived as influencing teacher practices. The purpose of this type of interview was to gather information about sentiments towards Question 2 and new language policies, ELDS, and the processes by which staff are prepared for their use and how the standards are implemented at the local level. The interviews with policy experts provided context and perspective to the interviews with K1 teachers. Hochschild (2009) explains that a central purpose of these elite interviews is "to acquire information and context that only that person can provide about some event or process" (p. 124). Interview questions probed as to whether or not policy experts viewed standards set forth in the documents as attainable for all students regardless of linguistic and cultural background.

3.4.2.2 Content and process of the interviews with policy experts

The content of the individual interview questions with policy experts—included in its entirety in Appendix H below—probed the connections between ELDS development and implementation and, their perceived relationship to young EBL students. In particular, questions centered on teacher education related to ELDS and teachers' utilization of the WIDA standards in conjunction with other standards documents that preschool teachers might access. For example, one of the questions asked: "What professional development supports/education are provided to prepare PreK teachers to use standards with their EBL students in particular?" Additionally, the interviews inquired about standards feedback and monitoring, as well as the

policy expert's familiarity with the Question 2 legislation and new language policies and his or her sentiments regarding the legislation and its effect on the EBL student population.

Interview appointments with education policy experts were arranged by email communication. The interviews occurred in person, either at the Massachusetts EEC, DESE, or BPS central office. Each interview lasted approximately one hour, not exceeding 90 minutes. The interviews with policy experts required some advanced research on the individual and their work (Hochschild, 2009). The process of the interviews with the policy experts focused around the perceptions of the relationship between Question 2 and new language policies, ELDS, and the needs of young EBL students.

3.4.2.3 Data coding of the interviews with policy experts

The analysis of the interview transcripts was ongoing and occurred simultaneous to the interviews with policy experts, allowing for a focused data analysis process in which reflections and themes could be identified. The interview transcripts were coded according to substantive categories, both emic concepts that participants used in making sense of their experiences, as well as inductively developed based on the researcher's description of what was going on.

My coding of the interviews with policy experts took place in four stages. The first stage was the initial open coding stage, where I wrote down notes, comments, and observations while reading through the transcripts (Merriam, 2009). In this stage, I explored large quantities of raw data and generated response codes while reading through the responses. A traditional approach to coding allows the codes to be constructed during the data analysis (Creswell, 2009). I employed a similar approach in developing my initial codes, which then prompted new concepts. In this coding phase, I relied on researcher interpretation and reflection on meaning. This data analysis strategy utilized both inductive and deductive analyses, as I worked back and forth between the

themes being discovered and the database to organize the data into comprehensive themes, and then iteratively review the data from the themes (Creswell, 2009).

The second stage involved focused coding, which included category development where codes were reexamined in order to further focus the data. As the research looked to unearth themes, the coding process aimed to produce patterns among the codes in order to keep them in the database. I began to combine and collapse categories, organize repeating ideas, and connect themes among the codes. In this stage I employed a constant comparative analytical method, wherein memos documented any changes made. I reviewed the categories and each time a passage of text was selected it was compared with passages already coded in order to ensure that coding was consistent and to see what revisions needed to be made.

The third stage was thematic coding, where I reexamined previous codes to refine the themes. I continued to revise the coding schema by adding more nuanced detail to each category. The fourth stage of coding involved extracting and applying theoretical concepts from the saturated categories and themes. At this point in the analysis, new data would not have altered the categories, as the essential codes had been formed.

3.4.3 Phase 3: Interviews with preschool teachers

3.4.3.1 Purpose of the interviews with teachers

The individual semi-structured audio-recorded interviews with preschool teachers in a third phase of data collection provided the opportunity to hear personal experiences in detail. The purpose of this type of interview was to gather information about the perceived relationship between ELDS, Massachusetts Question 2 and new language policies, and the needs of young EBL students. I conducted this third phase of data collection through individual interviews with

six preschool teachers (one teacher in each of the six Boston area preschool sites; two general education classrooms, two SEI classrooms, two DLL classrooms).

3.4.3.2 Content and process of the interviews with teachers

The content of the interviews with K1 teachers included questions about the extent to which teachers encourage their EBL students to access additional resources to support their learning, and the types of guidance and/or education teachers receive in working with EBL students. The questions went on to inquire about teacher sentiments towards ELDS in their early childhood classroom, as well as their experiences implementing standards in their classrooms, both with all of their students as well as specifically with their EBL students.

I tried to honor the interviewees' cultural identities by offering to conduct the interviews in English or in Spanish, if this was their language of choice. As I was looking at linguistically diverse preschool programs, it was probable that a teacher would prefer to speak in Spanish. Formerly a high school Spanish teacher, I could competently interview in this language. A translator would have been hired had the participant preferred the interview be conducted in a language other than Spanish or English; however, all interviews were conducted in English.

The interviews with K1 teachers were arranged by email communication. These interviews were conducted at the program sites and employed a continuous, flexible, and adaptable design (Rubin & Rubin, 2012). With the permission of the interviewee, the interviews were audio-recorded for ease of transcription. Each interview lasted approximately one hour, and none exceeded 90 minutes.

3.4.3.3 Data coding of the interviews with teachers

The same manner of coding that was conducted for the interviews with education policy experts was subsequently utilized to code the interview transcripts, as each sample set

represented a different population (policy expert interviews, teacher interviews) so a separate analysis was necessary. This four-part coding process involved open coding, focused coding, thematic coding, and exploring theoretical concepts that emerged from saturated categories and themes. I employed constant reflection on my own subjectivity during each interview on the nature of the discussion that I analyzed afterwards for bias (Rajendran, 2001).

3.4.4 Phase 4: Data analysis process

3.4.4.1 Validity and reliability in the data analysis process

In analyzing the data collected from the document review, policy interviews, and teacher interviews, qualitative validity and qualitative reliability allowed me to check for accuracy and credibility in my findings (Creswell, 2009). To ensure qualitative validity, I incorporated validity strategies such as 1) maximum variation sampling; 2) inter-rater reliability; 3) researcher reflexivity; and 4) peer debriefing. These particular checks were important in the context of my study because they lent credibility to the study by ensuring many variables that may affect the findings had been acknowledged and accounted for.

First, a maximum variation sampling strategy purposefully seeks variation or diversity in its design in order to allow for a greater range of transferability and application of the findings (Merriam, 2009). The criterion sampling in this study employed a maximum variation sampling design in order to leverage varying instances of a phenomenon by seeking a wide range of program types (Merriam, 2009; Patton, 2002). This study chose six sites that varied along the particular criteria of program type—either general education, SEI, or DLL—so that the research could explore shared patterns and themes as well as variations across the sites, in this way prioritizing diversity in programs serving young EBLs.

Second, I conducted an inter-rater reliability check with a peer who was knowledgeable about early childhood education and had experience working in an early childhood classroom. The goal of conducting an inter-rater reliability check was to ensure consistency and reliability across time between coders according to the codes assigned to the document. We coded one teacher interview in its entirety according to pre-set codes established after several readings of an interview transcript. We spent time discussing the codes to ensure that we held similar understandings of them, and used differences to discuss our interpretations of complex qualitative themes. I strove for at least an 80% reliability score, and we achieved an 83% reliability rate during this check. Inter-rater reliability in qualitative research can promote consistency in coding to ensure that codes are applied the same way across time, in this way supporting a more valid and rigorous analysis (McDonald et al., 2019).

Third, I was mindful to conduct the individual interviews with researcher reflexivity, contemplating my role in the research and how my biases might shape my interpretations of the data (Creswell, 2009). As I explored the interview transcripts, I continuously confronted my personal values and epistemological sociocultural orientation that promotes linguistic and cultural diversity, which compels me to adopt a critical lens in interpreting the data. I did this by regularly reviewing my notes and consulting with a peer in education who ensured that any interpretations were limited in their bias. Finally, for the individual interviews with teachers, I engaged in peer debriefing with an early childhood education researcher in my field who offered a new lens through which to view my data interpretation, thereby contributing to the study's trustworthiness.

3.4.4.2 Analysis of standards documents

In the document analysis, I used the above-detailed coding schema to categorize, analyze, and code information pertaining to EBLs in Massachusetts' standards documents. I analyzed the documents through content analysis, a systematic way to detail the contents in qualitative research (Merriam, 2009). Content analysis is both quantitative and qualitative in nature as it measures the variety and frequency of messages as well as the nature of the data (Merriam, 2009). Similar to coding the transcripts for the qualitative interviews, I engaged in analytical or axial coding by relating categories and findings to each other and continuously refining them (Merriam, 2009). Developing a system to code and catalogue the documents and the data facilitated analysis and interpretation (Merriam, 2009). Analytical coding aligns with data collection and analysis in qualitative research, as this process is "recursive and dynamic" (Merriam, 2009, p. 169) and requires ongoing analysis and interpretation of data. Indeed, Merriam (2009) believes that all qualitative data analysis is "inductive" and "comparative" (p. 175).

The ways in which I conducted my content analysis through the coding schema was a recursive, iterative process that constantly evolved based on how I found EBLs were represented. I did not assume any understanding of what I was looking for in the documents, so the categories were flexible and allowed for changes. As I looked for clues in the standards documents, I continuously refined the coding schema typology and the categories therein. Then I compared my findings against the other standards documents and revisited the documents as the categories evolved. The document analysis added potency and context to the interview aspect of the research, and helped solidify any thematic perceptions uncovered during that process.

3.4.4.3 Policy and teacher interview analysis

The analysis sought out in-depth, comprehensive data from individual interviews with teachers and policy experts in order to better understand the relationship between Question 2 and new language policies, ELDS documents, and the needs of EBLs. The interviews were transcribed in full, including any and all emphases and hesitations (Hochschild, 2009). The research adopted a spiral data analysis approach (Creswell, 2013) that began with organizing the data, developing memos and reading through the data, classifying the data into codes and themes, interpreting the data and drawing comparisons, and visually representing the data (Creswell, 2013). The process of developing and narrowing codes is critical to qualitative data analysis. Much like a spiral image, this process requires the researcher to analytically circle around, constantly returning to the data and the codes, as opposed to a linear approach to the data analysis (Creswell, 2013). This method of data coding necessitates ongoing analysis and interpretation of data, and leads to the construction of categories that capture recurring patterns across the data (Merriam, 2009). This inductive method of ongoing analysis ultimately shifted to a deductive method, whereby the established category scheme was then tested against the data (Merriam, 2009). Using a database to house the transcripts facilitated systematically reviewing and refining the codes and cataloguing findings. For the interview transcripts, I engaged in this type of analytical coding whereby I related the categories and findings to each other and continuously refined them (Merriam, 2009).

3.4.4.4 Integrated comparative data analysis and findings

After all sources of data were collected and independently analyzed from the interviews with K1 teachers, I first coded interview data from each site into salient themes and categories. Subsequently I conducted an analysis across the six semi-structured interviews with K1 teachers

(one at each of the six school sites) to compare and contrast them as well as find salient themes. I then conducted a teacher and policy cross-interview analysis. The benefits of a cross-interview analysis are manifold, and include constructing explanations across sites, making sense of unique findings, and articulating discovered concepts, modalities and themes. This type of analysis can prompt new questions and create new knowledge.

I organized all data of the study into one comprehensive and coherent database (Merriam, 2009). Organizing data into a large database that can systematically analyze large amounts of data can reduce bias (McGuiggan et al., 2008). The groupings developed from the data reflect a classification system of patterns, which become the themes or categories that cut across the data (Eisenhardt, 1989; Merriam, 2009; Yin, 1994). The computer program NVivo was used to help categorize themes into buckets in which all data was placed. This analytic strategy of developing categories is inductive—"when categories and their properties are reduced and refined and then linked together, the analysis is moving toward the development of a model or theory to explain the data's meaning" (Merriam, 2009, p. 192).

I included samples of interview excerpts inasmuch as they presented a telling and relevant story to support my data findings. I included what Maxwell (2005) refers to as quasi-statistics insomuch as they provided compelling data. Quasi-statistics are quantitative components of qualitative studies that allow you to assess the amount of evidence in the data that relate to a particular conclusion, such as how many instances exist and from how many sources (Maxwell, 2005). Proportions can suggest the strength with which the sample supports generalizations, particularly given that my sample was small and not representative of the universe of early educators who work with EBLs (Weiss, 1994). Proportions can also contribute to the reader's confidence in the analysis (Weiss, 1994).

3.5 Pilot Studies

3.5.1 Preschool teacher pilot

3.5.1.1 The nature of the pilot interview

This exploratory pilot interview, conducted in April of 2015, was developed during a graduate school qualitative methods course as a starting point around which future teacher interviews would be based. For this pilot, I conducted a semi-structured individual interview with a lead preschool teacher at a private community-based preschool program located in a Boston, Massachusetts suburb. The preschool program has a population made up of 40% emergent bilingual learners—the majority speaking Hebrew, with around 5% speaking Spanish and 5% speaking Russian or Polish (M. Szlempo, personal communication, December 9, 2015). Before beginning the 45-minute interview, I explained that I was interested in learning more about young emergent bilingual learners in preschool and their relationship with early learning and development standards. I opened with this information in order to remain transparent as well as to alert the interviewee to the nature of my research. I then asked permission to audio-record the interview, which was granted. The interview included basic questions of tenure, qualifications, and role in the school, and went on to ask pointed questions about early learning and development standards and their role in the classroom and effect on the interviewee's teaching style and practice.

3.5.1.2 Interview findings

These pilot interview data were coded and several salient themes were identified through the coding of the interview. These included: 1) an association with the classroom as English-only; 2) academic struggles of EBL students; 3) compatibility of ELDS in relation to the needs of EBLs; 4) unrealistic expectations of ELDS; 5) ideal of inclusivity in ELDS; 6) need for teacher

education and workshops on working with EBLs; 7) possible links inferred between EBLs and special education services. Several themes uncovered from the pilot were congruent with the themes that emerged from the research. An example of several of these emergent themes is visible in Appendix J.

This pilot interview validated my research questions directed towards preschool teachers because I was able to investigate some of the ways in which ELDS influenced one teacher's instructional practice in a preschool classroom. The pilot interview also validated my decision to use one-on-one interviews with K1 teachers instead of surveys. I opted to use individual interviews in conducting my research in order to holistically elicit more nuanced information from participants than could be gleaned in a survey, which aligned with my research questions about perceptions and attitudes of teachers and policy experts regarding ELDS and EBLs.

3.5.1.3 Relevance for intended research

I refined my interview protocol based on this pilot interview. I reviewed my research questions and the responses and subsequent themes that emerged. From the pilot interview analysis, I learned that my future interviews with preschool teachers must comprise only very pointed questions on ELDS, and that I should omit inquiring about perceptions regarding the accountability movement, curriculum, or assessments, as these questions have the potential to detract from the focus of my research. Furthermore, all questions should be presented in clear, unambiguous terminology, free from academic jargon. Additionally, the pilot analysis revealed a need for more targeted questions on the WIDA Early English Language Development standards and related teacher education. Additional questions were also needed related to teachers' use of scaffolding EBL students' learning in the classroom. This pilot also highlighted the need to

reorganize the order of questions according to those that appeared more relevant and produced more salient responses.

The timing of this interview was important, as my interviewee had 45 minutes to offer. I quickly realized that I needed to prioritize certain questions over others. As there was not enough time during the pilot interview to thoroughly address the questions in depth, I planned to allot 60 minutes for dialogue in future interviews, not to exceed 90 minutes, which I expected would be enough time to encourage a deeper discussion to probe specific questions.

3.5.2 Policy expert pilot

3.5.2.1 The nature of the pilot interview

A separate instrument for the individual interviews with policy experts was developed, piloted, and revised in the winter of 2016. For this pilot interview, I conducted a semi-structured exploratory one-on-one interview with an educator-and-provider-support specialist for the Massachusetts Department of Early Education and Care (EEC). When I contacted the EEC office, I was referred to this particular policy expert as someone to contact, as her work involved standards implementation. The interview was audio-recorded for ease of transcription. The interview began with basic questions of professional history and then went on to ask pointed questions about ELDS and their development and implementation. We met at the Boston-based EEC office for the interview. The interview lasted 50 minutes, so I planned to expand the allotted time for future interviews to one hour, not to exceed 90 minutes, should a longer, more in-depth discussion take place. The policy expert I interviewed in the pilot was not contacted for an interview in the full study.

3.5.2.2 Interview findings

I used the constant comparative method to analyze the qualitative interview data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Merriam, 2009). This approach is considered inductive and allows for an iterative process of coding the transcript to identify emergent patterns and themes in the data (Merriam, 2009). I designed a coding framework using Microsoft Excel, since the pilot was small and did not necessitate using software such as NVivo. My analysis began with an initial review of the transcript, which I then coded. I reviewed each code and then further refined the codes, repeating this pattern of re-reading and re-coding several times. These codes became the emergent themes from the interviews.

After these data were coded, several salient themes emerged from the interview responses. These included: 1) a need for more usable standards for teachers; 2) a need for more teacher education around standards; 3) a need to focus on outputs (such as standards use and effectiveness) in addition to inputs; and 4) increased attention to standards due to QRIS accountability. This pilot interview validated my research questions directed towards policy experts as I was able to explore some of the ways in which ELDS are perceived as influencing classroom practice and the strengths and weaknesses that surround standards use, particularly for EBLs. My pilot interview dialogue also substantiated the value in conducting these types of interviews with policy experts for my research, as I would not have been able to capture such nuanced information in a survey. An example of several of these emergent themes is visible in Appendix J.

An interesting finding in both the pilot interview with the preschool teacher as well as in the pilot with the policy expert was the way that the two stakeholders regarded teachers' use of the standards for accountability purposes. The preschool teacher stated: "So, and what I usually

do is I do what I do and then I look and see what the guidelines say [said in whisper]. I don't do it the other way around. I don't look at the guidelines and then see." In my later interview with the policy expert, she stated: "Sometimes you go out to a program and they feel that using the standards means they're labeling what standard they're doing in their curriculum planning. Uh, it actually, to some extent, really should be the other way around, right? Curriculum planning should actually flow from knowing and understanding what children should be able to do." Both of these quotations are listed in longer form in Appendix J. The disclosure of different ways of thinking about ELDS and their utility encouraged further exploration in the full study through interview questions that sought to understand the perceptions of standards and their application, particularly for EBLs.

The interview demonstrated that in replicating this methodological approach with other policy experts, I would likely be able to gather the necessary data to answer this study's research questions. The two pilot studies together illuminated the fact that both interviews with preschool teachers and policy experts were critical and would likely reveal more nuanced data on how various stakeholders make sense of ELDS in relation to young EBLs, as well as the larger language policy context within Massachusetts.

3.5.2.3 Relevance for intended research

I refined my interview protocol based on this pilot interview, after reviewing my research questions and the responses and themes that emerged. The pilot interview alerted me to the importance of asking targeted, focused questions with clear terminology. For example, when I asked about how standards can strengthen the continuum between preschool and formal kindergarten, based on the interviewee's response I realized that I should be asking instead about

how standards can strengthen the transitions from preschool to kindergarten, as transitions represent a critical period for students.

The pilot analysis revealed the need for many revisions to the interview protocol. First, the pilot analysis revealed a greater need for more targeted probes related to EBLs. During the pilot interview, the interviewee spoke at length about the topics directly related to her work in standards development and implementation, but had to be prompted regarding the EBL position. The lack of information I gained regarding the EBL experience alerted me to the importance of generating several specific probes related to EBL students in order to adequately address this topic. Secondly, during the pilot interview, I found that my interviewee answered several of my questions without being prompted, and I therefore had to quickly scan the remaining questions. I learned that I needed a better sense of the location of sub-themes so that I could access them with ease. Finally, I revised the protocol to include more opening questions on professional background, based on the natural flow of the pilot interview and the need to establish a relaxed and comfortable association. I planned to allot 60 minutes for dialogue, not to exceed 90 minutes, in future interviews.

3.6 Study Limitations

This study was limited in that it was based on a relatively small sample of six teachers and six policy experts, and it relied on interpretivist qualitative analysis. The study was limited in the one interview design per participant, which may have compromised trustworthiness as I was unable to reliably check respondents' comments, or return with follow-up questions. A set of three interviews with each teacher would have strengthened the design. Given the specific nature of the program models involved—and the fact that there were few dual language preschool classroom options—there was some selection bias in the ways in which the six schools were

selected as I received assistance from BPS central office staff (individuals whom I contacted without a prior connection or relationship) who aided me in connecting with several teachers and principals. Some teachers may have been motivated to participate in the study given their familiarity with the BPS staff who shared teachers' emails with me.

Moreover, teachers may have lacked interest or knowledge regarding the interview questions, thereby limiting the robustness of the information they provided. Further, teachers had limited free time in their schedule to participate in the interviews. The study's focus on ELDS may have influenced participants' perspectives, and policy experts may have been more amenable to giving a positive view of ELDS than teachers writ large, given their role in their development, revisions, and dissemination. Many of the above limitations—particularly scheduling conflicts as well as unwillingness to participate—extend to the policy experts, both those at EEC, DESE, as well as BPS.

While the research attempted to control for various types of classroom models where EBL students may attend in order to be representative (SEI, DLL, general education), it could not cover all classroom models and did not explore special education or inclusion classrooms. The study was not designed to be a representative study. My ability to analyze and report out data by agency (BPS, EEC, DESE) was also limited, as this might have compromised confidentiality.

Another limitation was the change from focus groups with teachers in the initial research design to one-on-one interviews. While the research design intended to include three focus groups, as described in the proposal, there were insufficient teachers to participate in focus groups at the schools that met the research criteria (fewer than three teacher participants). I therefore conducted individual in-person interviews with each K1 teacher, and expanded my

school site selection to six schools instead of three in order to conduct a total of six interviews instead of three interviews and three focus groups. While the possibility of this methodological change was accounted for in the research proposal design, the research could not yield the robust and dynamic conversation among teachers that was expected from the focus groups.

Other limitations emerged throughout the study. For instance, the absence of classroom observations may present a design limitation, as I relied solely on the reports of teachers' attitudes and behaviors, per the research questions, and not their enactment of ELDS. In hindsight I realized that data collection could have included artifacts from the classrooms during interviews with teachers, including photographing wall displays and collecting materials (such as handouts and assessment tools), as these could have enhanced the study's findings.

The Massachusetts 2002 Question 2 legislation imposes limitations of several different kinds. First, it presents a variable unable to be isolated, making it hard to account for the extent to which the legislation has influenced the field of early childhood education at large. Second, it is likely to have influenced the perceptions among preschool teachers and policy professionals who may therefore carry bias in regards to EBLs.

Finally, a change in the United States presidency and subsequent immigration policies in between beginning and completing this dissertation presented new limitations. The increasingly xenophobic rhetoric propelled by this political shift broadened the study's historical content within the literature review, while at the same time added depth to participants' responses in light of new legislation impacting EBLs statewide (i.e. the LOOK Act, 2017; an Act Relative to Educational Opportunity for Students, 2019) and federal policies (i.e. suspending travel for citizens of particular countries, 2017; increased immigrant deportation, 2017; phasing out DACA, ongoing; canceling Temporary Protective Status for particular countries, 2017;

separating minor children entering the United States from their parents, 2018; restricting asylum, 2018). All of these limitations have been carefully considered as factoring into the credibility of the study's findings.

Chapter IV – PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

This study sought to understand the interplay between ELDS and EBLs in preschool classrooms in Boston, Massachusetts. Findings from this study were divided into categories according to their respective research question. Questions explored the ways in which EBLs are positioned in ECE Massachusetts' standards, and how Boston K1 preschool teachers in SEI, DLL, and general education classrooms, as well as district and state level policy experts, perceive the relationships between Massachusetts language policy, ELDS, and the needs of young EBL students.

4.1 Findings Related to Research Question 1: How, and to what extent, are EBLs accounted for in written ECE Massachusetts standards documents and guidelines?

The following section represents a document analysis of eleven ELDS documents used in Massachusetts PreK classrooms. The purpose of this analysis was to review state ELDS documents for preschool-age children (three to five years of age) to determine the extent to which the standards include young EBLs and to uncover how EBLs are positioned, to identify approaches to meeting the needs of young EBLs, and to determine the extent to which the standards reflect the current scientific research on the learning and development of preschool-age EBLs.

4.1.1 Nomenclature

The nomenclature/terminology used to refer to EBLs varied considerably across the documents. "English Language Learners" was the most commonly used term, followed by "English Learners" and "Diverse/Dual Language Learners" or "Dual Language Learners." Other terms used include "Linguistically diverse students," "Children with language disabilities," "Limited English proficient," and "Heritage language speakers." The majority of the terms are

inclusive in nature with the exception of "Children with language disabilities" and "Limited English proficient" which view EBLs through a deficit perspective in which children learning English as a second language are considered handicapped, disabled, or problematic (García et al., 2008).

4.1.2 EBL references towards educators or student outcomes

The analysis also explored the extent to which ELDS statements related to EBLs were geared towards educators, students, or both educators and student outcomes. The EBL references geared towards educators included prompts for educators to reflect on the inclusivity of their practices and curriculum, and those geared towards students reflected student activities and expected outcomes/evidence of learning. The analysis revealed that one out of eleven documents (ACF) included EBL references geared towards student outcomes, and five out of eleven documents (FL, STECF, ELAL, CFM, HSSCF) included EBL references geared towards educators and putting the onus on educator practices towards EBLs. Four out of eleven documents (GPLE, WIDA, SELAPL, GPKLE) included EBL references geared towards both educator practices and student outcomes. One document (CHCF) did not include EBL references towards EBL educator practices or student outcomes. Given that ELDS are designed to describe the learning expectations for young children, this pattern breakdown clearly indicates a need for greater emphasis on expectations for EBL student outcomes and practices.

4.1.3 Where EBLs are mentioned in ELDS

The following several sections refer to where EBLs are mentioned in the standards documents, either in the introduction/statement of philosophy, language/literacy domain, other domains, no mention of EBLs, or the appendix/conclusion material. An understanding of where EBLs are addressed in these documents is important because it can determine the extent to which

ELDS reflect scientific research on the learning and development of PreK EBLs (Espinosa & Calderón, 2015), and identify supports for meeting the needs of EBLs across domains of development. Pinpointing exactly where EBLs are, or are not, mentioned in ELDS documents can assist Massachusetts in enhancing state ELDS and ensuring that they are appropriate for EBLs, with the ultimate goal of supporting educators in serving EBLs. Exclusion, or superficial inclusion, of EBLs across domains of development could signal misinformation on EBLs' development and learning needs, as well as a need for policy revisions to ELDS.

4.1.3.1 EBLs mentioned in introduction/statement of philosophy

Six of the eleven documents specifically mention EBLs in their introductions or statements of philosophy. These include: WIDA, SELAPL, GPKLE, ELAL, CFM, HSSCF. Of these six documents, five inform the reader in their overviews of the document organization that the standards or the supplementary resources that follow the standards address guidance in applying the standards for English language learners and students with disabilities. These five introductory statements lump learners of the English language with students with disabilities and signal a deficit perspective of language ability. For example, the ELAL states:

> It is also beyond the scope of the standards to define the full range of supports appropriate for English learners and for students with disabilities. Still, all students must have the opportunity to learn and meet the same high standards if they are to access the knowledge and skills that will be necessary in their post-high-school lives. (ELAL, p. 15)

In this example, EBLs are implicitly labeled from a deficit perspective, as the statement presumes that students learning English as a second language may be limited in their ability to communicate but does not reference their funds of knowledge nor leverage their home language. EBLs are othered, pathologized, and conceptualized in terms of deficits due to the Eurocentric alignment of dominant approaches to early education. These developmental

benchmarks—based on the cultural community of the dominant group in society—do not reflect minoritized backgrounds and cultures (Rogoff, 1990).

The SELAPL similarly combines EBL and special education students together in the ninth guiding principle listed: "Focus on the developmental aspects of the standards, and continuous improvement of skills for all individual children, especially those with special needs and dual language learners" (p. 5). At the same time, the overview on using the standards document recognizes the influence of language and culture on children's learning, and continues: "Children will develop and demonstrate various skills and learning competencies along a continuum, depending on their individual experiences within their families and in early childhood programs, as well as on their language, culture, and individual abilities or disabilities" (p. 7). Further, below the indicators in each standard box, the document states that children may need different levels of support according to their abilities, culture, and family, thereby acknowledging the influence of children's diverse cultures on learning and development.

The GPKLE, while grouping EBLs with students with disabilities, at the same time encourages educators to consider the context of children's family and culture, and acknowledges that early language and literacy set the foundation for later learning. In an introductory section titled "educator reflection," educators are asked, "to what extent do I understand children's families, cultures, and communities, and use that understanding to connect instruction with children's experiences?" (p. 4).

The only document that includes EBLs in the introductory material of the standards documents but does *not* link them to students with disabilities is the WIDA, which offers an extensive introduction on the standards' intended audience, uses, and understanding the framework, all with particular attention to EBLs. The WIDA standards are supportive of EBLs

and consider the sociocultural contexts within which EBLs learn and develop. The standards underscore the importance of understanding children's home language and cultures and encourage translanguaging across languages. The introduction to the WIDA specifically states that the standards are intended to "help support the unique language needs of children ages 2.5-5.5 years who are in the process of learning more than one language prior to kindergarten entry" (p. 3). The document states that the standards are intended for use by practitioners, professionals, and parents, and that the standards align with the WIDA English Language Development Standards for K-12 as well as states' early learning standards, and therefore they are a consistent resource for states to support and assess their EBLS.

Further, an outline of the framework describes the WIDA Can Do Philosophy, which is the belief that children bring cultural and linguistic knowledge and skills from their homes and communities to their learning, and educators must create learning opportunities that build on these assets. The document also outlines its Guiding Principles, representing WIDA's beliefs about language development, including recognizing the key role that home language plays in English language development. Indeed, the WIDA introduction recognizes that EBLs are often viewed with a deficit perspective, with educators undervaluing their skillsets or mistakenly believing that one's home language will interfere with learning English. The introduction states: "The cognitive function is a reminder to practitioners that DLLs need access to the same level of thinking as their peers regardless of their language development level" (p. 20), and encourages educators to rise to the occasion with critical and challenging materials and strategies for EBLs.

An additional document—the FL—extolls the benefits of learning a second language on students' intellectual growth, positively influencing student performance, yet does not distinctly refer to language learning for EBLs but rather to English-speaking students learning an

additional language. Even so, the document states in its guiding principles that learning a second language supports the development of a child's first language, literacy skills, communication skills, and appreciation for diverse cultures. This document is not included in the count of six documents that mention EBLs in their introductions or statements of philosophy. Similarly, the GPLE includes language that is not specific to EBLs but still holds relevance for young children's language development, as it states that children's English language skills should be a significant component of the preschool curriculum, as early childhood is a critical period for the foundational development of language and vocabulary skills. This statement is perhaps interesting commentary on Question 2 and pushing an English-only agenda in classrooms, since that legislation passed in 2002, one year before the approval of the GPLE.

4.1.3.2 EBLs mentioned in language/literacy domain

Three of the eleven documents (GPLE, WIDA, GPKLE) distinctly mention EBLs in their Language/Literacy domain. The original GPLE document—still in use today until the latest draft version is finalized—includes EBLs in the Reading and Literature domain. Standard 6a: "Listen to a wide variety of age appropriate literature read aloud"—includes "explore a wide variety of printed materials about subjects that interest children (e.g., storybooks, picture dictionaries, factual and informational books such as books about science, and books that relate to families and cultures), with texts of varying levels of difficulty" (p. 9). Standard 15c:

> Listen to, recognize, and use a broad vocabulary of sensory words—includes describe everyday experiences using sensory language (e.g., 'the play dough felt sticky;' 'the cotton is soft;' 'the sandpaper is scratchy'). Note: Children with expressive language disabilities or limited English proficiency may be able to indicate understanding of terms by pointing to appropriate illustrations or sensory materials. (GPLE, p. 11)

In the later example, EBLs are lumped with students with language disabilities, perpetuating the notion that EBL's abilities are deficient and linked with disability rather than viewing children's

linguistic knowledge and home languages as positive assets. In this example, students are able only to point to illustrations or materials but their home language or knowledge is not accessed.

The WIDA standards directly mention EBLs in their Language/Literacy domain, referred to as the second WIDA standard, Language of Early Language Development and Literacy. This standard states that "dual language learners communicate information, ideas, and concepts necessary for academic success in the content area of Early Language Development and Literacy" (p. 16). The standard is then subdivided into six strands of model performance indicators, which consist of three language levels of English language development for each language domain. The cognitive function described in each subdomain states that children at all levels of English language development either analyze or understand story elements. The Language of Early Language Development and Literacy standard is tied to the particular cognitive functions of EBLs, and recognizes EBLs' strengths across three levels, either entering, developing, or bridging their English language abilities. At the same time, this standard positions academic language (English) as the norm against which EBLs' development is measured. This section offers few examples of how EBL children may demonstrate the particular standard and cognitive function, and only one of the six strands of model performance indicators references use of home language to describe story objects, characters and events (p. 39).

In the current draft of the GPKLE, EBLs are included in the English Language Arts domain. The introduction to this domain explains that the guidelines are intended to recognize children's varied life and school experiences, stating, for example:

> While the outcome of 'printing upper and lower case letters' is not expected until kindergarten, there may be preschoolers who are able to demonstrate that competency. Likewise, children who enter kindergarten with little or no experiences, or who have developmental or language needs, may need additional experiences or support to make progress toward meeting the outcome. (GPKLE, p. 1)

This introductory statement links students with language needs to students with developmental needs. Moreover, all children arrive at kindergarten with varied life experiences, and stating that children may enter kindergarten "with little or no experiences" denies children's important realities and competencies. In the section on Questions for Educators to Ask Themselves, the document asks educators to reflect: "Do I have books and images that reflect diverse cultures, families and communities?" (p. 2), promoting the critical question of how inclusive the materials are in the classroom.

The overview of the Speaking and Listening domain calls for educators to support culturally and linguistically minoritized learners. The introduction states that educators should:

> Recognize and respect differences in communication. For example, in some cultures, children are not expected to participate in conversations with adults, but rather are engaged as listeners and observers; in others it may be considered disrespectful for children to make eye contact when conversing with an adult, while in others the opposite is true. (GPKLE, p. 31)

The overview explains that some strategies and activities have been drawn from the WIDA E-ELD standards. This section of the domain overview carefully considers how educators should recognize and respect children's cultural and linguistic differences, drawing upon WIDA strategies.

The overview of the Language domain underscores the importance of both having a strong foundation in language development for EBLs in early childhood and exposure to stories and music in their native language. The overview states that "learning one or more new languages during early childhood is a natural process because young children are still acquiring language" (p. 38), and "for children learning English there should be exposure to rich stories, music and experiences in their native language as well" (p. 38). Further, this introduction states:

> Children who are just starting to learn the English language, or children with limited vocabularies, need many opportunities to use language in conversation, look at illustrations and written language in books, and listen to others speak and read aloud…The speaking and listening abilities of these children in particular should be closely observed and assessed on an ongoing basis during classroom activities. (GPKLE, p. 38)

This section of the domain overview emphasizes the importance of closely monitoring and assessing EBL children's language learning and supporting EBLs through a variety of interactive language opportunities.

4.1.3.3 EBLs mentioned in other domains

Six out of eleven standards documents mention EBLs in other domains. These six documents are: ACF, FL, GPLE, WIDA, SELAPL, and GPKLE. Across the six documents, the domains represented include: dance, music, the arts, communication, early language development and literacy, cultures, communities, physical development, self-awareness, social awareness, relationship skills, approaches to play and learning, social and emotional development, science and technology/engineering, mathematics, and social studies. There is little overlap across the documents in domains represented. Where there is overlap, two documents (ACF, GPLE) reference EBLs within an arts domain (dance, arts, or music); three documents (WIDA, SELAPL, GPKLE) reference EBLs within a social and emotional development domain; two documents (GPLE, WIDA) reference EBLs within a physical development domain; and two documents (WIDA, GPKLE) reference EBLs within a science or technology/engineering domain.

The ACF signifies the importance of understanding and respecting a variety of cultures within the domain of dance and within a "connections strand" that links the arts to other disciplines. For example, PreK-12 Standard 5 states that by the end of grade 4, students should "observe dances from a variety of cultures and describe their movements. For example, students

or adults demonstrate dances that are part of their cultural heritage, and students in the audience describe the movements" (p. 31). Similarly, PreK-12 Standard 6 states that by the end of grade 4:

> Students will investigate uses and meanings of examples of the arts in children's daily lives, homes and communities. For example, children learn and teach other children songs in languages other than English; interview parents and community members about dances, songs, images, and stories that are part of their family and cultural heritage. (ACF, p. 96)

While the ACF indicates that respecting various cultures, and nodding to songs in languages other than English, are worthy goals, the examples are few and far between. Moreover, EBLs are othered in the superficial treatment of cultural dances, and conceptualized in terms of deficits linked with Eurocentric developmental benchmarks, which is an inaccurate reflection of ethnically and linguistically minoritized individuals (Rogoff, 1990).

The FL references EBLs within the overviews to the Communication, Cultures, and Communities strands. Within the Communication strand, there is a section entitled the Communicative Modes and Heritage Language Speakers, which is directed towards understanding the definition of heritage language speakers and understanding their unique learning trajectory. This section explains that heritage language speakers—students who speak a language other than English at home while receiving little to no formal instruction in the language's grammar—have varying abilities and proficiencies in their heritage language; "often they can carry on fluent and idiomatic conversation (interpersonal mode) but require instruction that will allow them to develop strengths in reading and interpreting (interpretive mode) and formal speaking and writing (presentational mode)" (p. 28).

The Cultures strand includes a section entitled Language and Culture: The Teachers' Tasks, which guides educators to an understanding of the inherent interconnectedness between language and culture, and explains that language and culture cannot be separated but rather are

best taught in conjunction. Further, this section emphasizes the importance of teaching language comprehensively, stating the critical importance of including "the cultural components embedded in the language they are studying, and of thus empowering them to unlock the secrets of the language, which dictionaries often neglect and which native speakers take for granted" (p. 39). This section goes on to say that if students "are only taught the language, denuded of its cultural accretions, they will have acquired a dry, bare-bones medium of communication, utilitarian but devoid of imagination, style, or the richness of the human spirit" (p. 39). This poignant evaluation of teaching a second language urges educators to thoughtfully and comprehensively impart language learning that includes accompanying cultural practices.

The introduction to the Communities strand encourages students to participate in their communities through storytelling, song and dance, exchanging biographical information, and engaging in service learning, which will "benefit students to become aware of the varieties among dialects, rates of speech, and styles of expression among native speakers of a language, and the accompanying cultural implications" (p. 59). Finally, while the Comparison strand references EBLs within select standards, they are geared towards students at the end of grade four and are thus not specific towards preschool-age children.

While there are select references to EBLs in the FL document, the document perpetuates the two modalities of learning a new language—that of learning English as a non-monolingual English speaker, and learning a foreign language as a monolingual English speaker. Indeed, this dynamic represents a hegemonic power structure in that the expectations and instructional levels are presented as more challenging for monolingual English learners studying a foreign language than the quality of education that EBLs typically receive (Valdés, 1997). While monolingual English-speaking students are celebrated when they can minimally speak a foreign language,

non-monolingual EBLs are held to a higher standard and expected to achieve fluency in the same time period (Cervantes-Soon, 2014). This double standard is an example of educational inequality where power has been distributed top down from a monolingual English-centric perspective that views bilingualism with a problem-oriented focus. The irony of this double standard is evident throughout the FL document, which glamorizes second language learning for monolingual English speakers:

> Knowledge of other languages and cultures also opens the door to many types of leisure activities. On their television screens and computer monitors, Americans have a direct link with other cultures. The person who has learned another language can read the literature of other cultures directly, not just in translation. As Americans travel to other countries and interact with speakers of other languages, they realize that competence in more than one language and knowledge of other cultures empower them to experience more fully the artistic and cultural creations of those cultures. (FL, p. 60)

Language power dynamics are further evident, as the document states that "programs in both modern and classical languages should also allow students to develop knowledge of literature, history, and culture" (p. 12); this stance venerates the learning of other cultures for monolingual English speakers, while EBLs' cultures are often undervalued and underrepresented within an English dominant environment. In line with Cervantes-Soon (2014), the FL document mandates that students become proficient in at least one language in addition to English prior to high school graduation, while paradoxically EBLs' native language capabilities often go unappreciated.

The GPLE mentions EBLs in the physical development domain and the music domain. Standard 13b in the physical development domain states: "Have a food-tasting party with samples of a wide variety of nutritious foods, especially those that may be unfamiliar at home, or 'snacks' from other cultures" (p. 35). It is notable that "snacks" are italicized, perhaps connoting that they are not "real" foods but rather romanticizing them as a novelty yet illegitimate, othering

EBLs. In the music domain, standard 8d states: "Listen to and sing many nursery rhymes, lullabies, and songs from around the world" (p. 41); and standard 11d states: "Invite parents and other visitors to demonstrate music, instruments, and dances from various cultures" (p. 41). Both of these music standard examples indicate the importance of understanding and respecting a variety of cultures, yet they represent a superficial and stereotypical treatment of EBLs, which positions EBLs at the margins within a dominant Eurocentric approach to early education, directly contradicting Rogoff's (1990) sociocultural approach.

Other GPLE domains fail to include EBLs and their diverse languages and cultures. The reading and literature domain includes standard 6e: "Handle books respectfully and appropriately, holding them right-side-up and turning pages one at a time from front to back" (p. 9). Despite the many types of alphabets—as well as non-alphabetic script—across cultures, in which books are read from right to left, top to bottom, and left to right, the document's 2003 publication date (just one year after the passing of Question 2) could perhaps reflect the promotion of English dominant literacy practices. Similarly, standard 12j—"sing traditional lullabies" (p. 11) raises the question of whose traditional lullabies are being promoted, and could perhaps reflect the English language dominance stemming from Question 2. This same pattern is reflected in standard 26a within the technology and engineering domain:

> Observe the ways animals use parts of their bodies compared to humans (e.g., some birds have hooked bills that they use to open seeds; a person might use a nutcracker to accomplish a similar task; an animal might tear food apart with its teeth; a person would use a knife and fork). (GPLE, p. 25)

This standard does not account for the myriad ways in which other cultures eat, for example with one's hands or chopsticks. Standards 12a and 12b within the history and social science domain—"Listen to age-appropriate stories about national figures and holidays; participate in developmentally appropriate and meaningful events and activities related to national holidays

such as Columbus Day, Thanksgiving, Martin Luther King, Jr. Day, Presidents' Day, and Independence Day" (p. 30)—similarly do not consider other holidays or celebrations important to the minoritized students in the classroom. Standard 3d within the movement and dance domain states: "Play traditional games and dances (e.g., Loobie Loo, Hokey Pokey" (p. 39)—but does not mention other movement and dance traditions that may be important to the minoritized students in the classroom, nor does it suggest drawing upon their cultural funds of knowledge as a more inclusive practice. These examples fail to include EBLs, instead assuming dominant Eurocentric development to be the norm, contradicting Rogoff's (1990) assertion that developmental benchmarks must reflect minoritized backgrounds and cultures.

The WIDA document mentions EBLs throughout all domains, including the Language of Social and Emotional Development, Early Language Development and Literacy, the Language of Mathematics, the Language of Science, the Language of Social Studies, and the Language of Physical Development. Within the Language of Social and Emotional Development domain, the topic-related language below each standard states some variation of the following statement: "Children at all levels of language development interact with developmentally appropriate words and expressions such as: Show me, where is the, sad, happy" (p 28). Within the example context for language use—"children role play and express feelings with their peers in small group settings"—levels 1, 3, and 5 reference home language through acting out actions from oral statements using home language (p. 30). Within the example context for language use—"children talk, play games and interact with their peers in small group settings"—levels 1, 3, and 5 reference home language through naming activities associated with sharing use of home language, i.e. "I go first, despues es tu turno" (p. 32). Within the example context for language use—"children talk about and create a class book about cooperation in a large group setting"—

levels 1, 3, and 5 reference home language through describing activities associated with cooperation in home language (p. 33).

Within the Language of Early Language Development and Literacy domain, in the example context for language use—"children retell familiar stories with a partner"—levels 1, 3, and 5 reference home language through describing stories using home language (p. 39). Within the example context for language use—"children play games and interact with their peers in small group settings"—levels 1, 3, and 5 reference home language through naming geometric shapes using home language, i.e. "I see a circulo big" (p. 45). Within the Language of Science domain in the example context for language use—"children play games and interact with their peers in small group settings"—levels 1, 3, and 5 reference home language through naming real-life objects and their properties in home language (p. 51). Within the Language of Social Studies domain in the example context for language use—"children talk about and dramatize ways they travel from one place to another in small group settings"—levels 1, 3, and 5 reference home language through naming vehicles and associated actions in home language (p. 55). Within the example context for language use—"children talk about and role play different occupations in small group settings"—levels 1, 3, and 5 reference home language through describing activities associated with occupations in home language, i.e. "I be my papa. My papa works in l'usine" (p. 57).

Within the Language of Physical Development domain in the example context for language use—"children play and move to music within large group settings"—levels 1, 3, and 5 reference home language through acting out actions from oral descriptions using home language (p. 60). Within the example context for language use—"children talk, play, and interact with their peers outdoors"—levels 1, 3, and 5 reference home language through naming activities

associated with outdoor play in home language (p. 61). Within the example context for language use—"children talk, play, and interact with their peers outdoors"—levels 1, 3, and 5 reference home language through recounting activities associated with outdoor play in home language (p. 62). Within the example context for language use—"children talk, play and interact with their peers outdoors"—levels 1, 3, and 5 reference home language through describing activities associated with outdoor play in home language, i.e. "I go in tunnel" (p. 63). While the WIDA document mentions EBLs throughout all domains, there are only select examples of how EBLs may demonstrate meeting the standards.

The SELAPL references EBLs throughout many domains. Below all standards and indicators within the document, a subtext reads: "Each child may require differing levels of support based on ability, learning style, culture, family, and experience to progress developmentally" (p. 9). Within the domain of Self-Awareness, standard SEL1—"recognizing, identifying, and expressing emotions"—states: "The display of emotions, and therefore the understanding of others' emotions, is a gateway to forming relationships with others. This awareness and expression is strongly associated with cultural norms" (p. 9). Similarly, standard SEL2—"accurate self-perception"—states:

> Children's self-concept, whether positive or negative, can greatly impact their motivation to learn, as well as their engagement in social interactions, satisfaction with efforts, willingness to take on challenges, etc. Culture, environment, and experience influence self-perception. Understanding and respecting these elements is essential to fostering healthy development. (SELAPL, p. 10)

This same standard also states that by the end of preschool, a child may "identify personal and family structures (show awareness of themselves as belonging to one or more groups)" (p. 10). Standard SEL3—"self-efficacy"—states: "Confidence (self-concept) is related to a person's belief and feelings about their self-worth. Self-worth is not constant, but develops over time. It is

influenced by environment, external feedback, challenges, social context, cultural, and other factors (e.g., some cultures value interdependence more than independence)" (p. 11). These examples indicate that the development of empathy, self-concept, and self-worth are heavily influenced by cultural norms.

The introduction to the domain of Social Awareness states that "social awareness is defined as the ability to take the perspective of and empathize with others from diverse backgrounds and cultures, to understand social and ethical norms for behavior, and to recognize family, school, and community resources and supports (CASEL, 2013)" (p. 13). The introduction further states that "cultural, familial, and experiential information influence this area of development" (p. 13). Standard SEL6—"respect for others"—states: "As children gradually begin to understand themselves in a broader context, they begin to recognize and respect differences such as race, culture, language, abilities, and family structures" (p. 14). This same standard also notes that by the end of preschool, a child may "demonstrate awareness of commonalities and differences among people (e.g., gender, race, ability/disability, language, family structure)" and "demonstrate interest in or curiosity about others' families, languages, and cultures" (p. 14). The standard examples within this domain indicate that young children's diverse cultures and languages should be recognized and respected, an important nod towards appreciating EBLs and their knowledge as assets within the classroom.

Within the domain of Relationship Skills, standard SEL7—"communication"—observes:

> Children may communicate/share their personal thoughts, feelings, and needs with other children or adults in a variety of non-verbal ways (e.g., facial expression, body language, communication boards, drawings, movement, etc.). This is especially true for children with disabilities and/or those who are dual language learners (WIDA, 2007). Communication is greatly influenced by cultural experiences (e.g., who speaks to whom and about what topics). (SELAPL, p. 15)

While nonverbal modes of communication indeed may support EBLs in their ability to share thoughts and needs, this standard lumps EBLs with children with disabilities, and views their language abilities with a deficit perspective that sees nonverbal modes of communication as a singular option for EBLs and denies their linguistic knowledge and capabilities. This same standard also states that by the end of preschool, a child may:

> Engage in meaningful communication or conversations with other children throughout the day (including home language or alternative communication systems as needed); engage in meaningful communication or conversations with adults in the program (including home language or alternative communication systems as needed); with support, listen or demonstrate attention when others talk (or communicate in non-verbal ways that have been taught, such as gestures, sign language). (SELAPL, p. 15)

These examples of evidence of demonstrating the standard consistently show that the use of home language is an important way for EBLs to display the ability to communicate with others. Standard SEL8—"social engagement and relationship building"—states in the standard overview that "it is important to honor children's differing experiences, family styles, and cultural expectations in order to build to their capacity to fully participate in educational opportunities and in society" (p. 16), signaling the significance of respecting and honoring EBLs' cultural norms in fostering social relationships.

The introduction to the domain of Approaches to Play and Learning: The Impact of Cultural Patterns and Values is one long excerpt stating the significance of respecting cultural variation and the impact of differing cultural values on approaches to learning. In particular, this excerpt advocates for a strength-based perspective of cultural variation wherein children's variations in learning are respected, as opposed to a deficit perspective that views learning as static and invariable. The introduction explains that cultural patterns and values predispose children to learn in many different ways:

> For example, in some cultures, children are encouraged to learn by engaging actively in dialogue with their parents; in other traditions, children play a more receptive role, listening quietly to parents' instructions and guidance; in still other cultures, children learn through observation, imitation, and non-verbal communication. Cultural variation may affect children's work styles, including their comfort working independently or socially; and it may affect children's distractibility or ability to focus. (SELAPL, p. 21)

This section urges educators not to view these variations in approaches to learning as deficiencies but rather as "equivalent strategies" that must be respected in order to encourage children's engagement and development.

Within the domain of Approaches to Play and Learning, standard APL1—"initiative"—states that "shyness, cultural differences, or prior experiences may inhibit initiative, but need not be a barrier to success" (p. 22), prompting educators to acknowledge the impact of cultural variation on EBLs' initiative within their learning. Within standard APL8—"memory"—the introduction states that "for children who are dual language learners, it can be particularly important to associate new concepts with terms in their home language. Storing information in the form of 'scripts' (sequences of steps or events) can help children to predict what will happen in future scenarios" (p. 29). The introduction to this standard directly informs educators about the benefits of incorporating EBLs' home languages into their learning, particularly as it supports memory and information recall. Finally, the Glossary of the SELAPL references EBLs in the definition of Dual Language Learners, described as "children, age birth to five years, who are learning two or more languages simultaneously" (p. 30). Other relevant terms included here are "culture"—"shared attitudes, beliefs, histories, arts, customs, and social or family practices that generally characterize a particular group of people" (p. 30) and "home language"—"first language a child learns to speak with family" (p. 31).

The GPKLE references EBLs throughout many domains. Within the domain of Social and Emotional Development and Approaches to Play and Learning, standard SEL1—"the child

will be able to recognize, identify, and express his/her emotions"—states that educators could "engage in two-way communication with families to understand family and cultural mores around expressing emotions" (p. 2). Within standard SEL2—"the child will demonstrate accurate self-perception"—the possible learning activities state that children could "describe cultural or family celebrations and traditions; show or talk about objects from family or culture" (p. 4) and children may "know and share important personal information (e.g., name, parents'/guardians' names, address), and recognize when sharing is not appropriate (e.g., family or cultural norms about sharing information)" and "demonstrate awareness and appreciation of self as part of a family, culture/ethnicity, language, community, or group" (p. 4). This standard also states that educators could "read books/stories that reflect children's cultures and differing abilities (e.g., Whoever You Are by Mem Fox)"; "display culturally relevant materials that allow children to 'see themselves' in books, dolls, photographs, posters, and dramatic play materials"; "ensure that the environment is safe from bias (cultural or other forms) and point out negative stereotypes or bias in books and media"; "foster children's respect for other children's skills, accomplishments and efforts"; and "ensure that children have equal opportunities to take part in all activities and use all materials regardless of gender, language or differing abilities" (p. 4). This standard celebrates children's multilingualism and multiculturalism and puts the onus on educators to bring supportive practices for EBLs into the classroom.

Standard SEL4—"the child will demonstrate impulse control and stress management"—states that educators could "engage in two-way communication with families to understand family and cultural mores around self-regulation" (p. 6). Similar to the previous GPKLE standards, this standard holds educators responsible for understanding and respecting different cultural norms. The introduction to Social Awareness explains the importance of children

developing the ability to understand what they are learning about themselves and applying it to others as they observe behavior, emotions, and activities, noting how culture influences this area of development. This introduction recognizes and respects children's diverse backgrounds and acknowledges their influence on social awareness.

Standard SEL6—"the child will recognize diversity and demonstrate respect for others"—states that children may "identify commonalities and differences (e.g., gender, race, ability/disability, language, family structure, etc.)" and that educators could "use resources that relate to the cultural, linguistic or developmental backgrounds of children in the group (e.g., Mama Goose: A Latino Nursery Treasury by Ada & Campoy; Black is Brown is Tan by Adoff; Just Like You by Albee)" (p. 9). The introduction to Relationship Skills states that "relationship skills are defined as the ability to establish and maintain healthy and rewarding relationships with diverse individuals and groups," and the introduction to Interpersonal Communication states that interpersonal communication "enables children to share commonalities and connect with others in a meaningful way," adding that these things are "especially true for children with disabilities and/or those who are dual language learners" (p. 9). While the introductions to these subdomains underscore the importance of cross-cultural communication, at the same time, just as in the SELAPL domain of Relationship Skills, while nonverbal modes of communication may support EBLs in their ability to share thoughts and needs, this standard lumps EBLs together with children with disabilities.

Standard SEL7—"the child will demonstrate the ability to communicate with others in a variety of ways"—states that children may "engage in meaningful and reciprocal interactions with other children throughout the day (including home language or alternative communication systems as needed)"; "engage in meaningful communication or conversations with program staff

(including home language or alternative communication systems as needed)"; and "listen or demonstrate attention and respond when peers or adults talk (or communicate in non-verbal ways such as sign language, gestures, body language)" (p. 10). Additionally, the standard advises educators to "encourage children to share ideas, feelings, experiences, and perspectives in whatever communication mode they can" and "support children learning English in a variety of ways (e.g., books in home languages; teach key words/phrases; label materials in home languages" (p. 10). This standard underscores the role that home language plays for EBLs in the classroom setting, as well as advises educators to nurture children's home language development and culture in the classroom. Likewise, standard SEL8—"the child will engage socially, and build relationships with other children and with adults"—states that educators could "engage in two-way communication with families to understand family and cultural mores around adult-child relationships" (p. 11). Standard SEL10—"the child will demonstrate the ability to seek help and offer help"—states that children could "use a volunteer chart to sign up to help others with particular tasks (e.g., support a new child to learn classroom routines; aid a child learning English; help with zipping, shoe tying, etc.)" (p. 13), underscoring how supporting EBL children can be mutually beneficial for EBLs and non-EBLs.

Within the domain of Approaches to Play and Learning, standard APL1—"the child will demonstrate initiative, self-direction, and independence"—states that educators could "engage in two way communication with families to understand family and cultural mores regarding independence, self-direction" (p. 18). Standard APL4—"the child will demonstrate creativity in thinking and use of materials"—states that children may "use humor to play with concepts/language or to engage or entertain others as culturally appropriate (e.g., jokes, riddles, songs, rhymes)" (p. 21). These two references to EBLs within the Approaches to Play and

Learning domain suggest the importance of understanding how cultural norms can influence children's initiative and creativity. However, this domain is largely limited in the quantity and quality of references to EBLs.

The final domain that references EBLs within the GPKLE is the Life Science strand within the Science and Technology/Engineering domain. Standard Pre-K-LS1-1 states that educators could "ask questions to assess what children know about body parts, especially children from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds. Introduce the names and functions of body parts based on this assessment, to relate children's prior knowledge to the new concept" (p. 13). This reference to EBLs within the Science and Technology/Engineering domain suggests the importance of scaffolding EBLs' subject-area and vocabulary knowledge in order to support their learning. Standard PreK-LS3-1 additionally states "*Note: be sensitive to implications of human resemblance of children to parents. Children who are adopted or who are multi-racial may not look like their parents" (p. 20).

Reviewed together, these six documents do not demonstrate a high degree of respect for linguistically and culturally minoritized children in the domain introductions or embedded within the standards themselves. Although EBLs are cited and included in these six documents, the ways in which they are referred to is often stereotypical and superficial. Stereotypical inclusion at the margins is not a position of inclusion for EBLs. EBLs are othered and conceptualized in terms of deficits stemming from a Eurocentric dominant approach to development, which does not reflect minoritized backgrounds and cultures (Rogoff, 1990).

Two out of the six documents (SELAPL, GPKLE) lump students together with students with disabilities, and two out of the six documents (FL, GPLE) perpetuate the English dominance sometimes evident in the documents, with domains that undermine EBLs and their

diverse languages and cultures, and standards that do not reflect the myriad ways in which children from non-dominant cultures read, eat, celebrate holidays, or sing or dance (see section 1.3c above), marginalizing and othering EBLs as inferior to the Eurocentric alignment of dominant approaches to education. Nearly all of the documents include references to EBLs in select domain overviews, including discussing the benefits of home language use and respecting culturally and linguistically minoritized students, yet all lack examples of activities using the standards with EBLs within the standards themselves, and treat EBL inclusion superficially. Only one out of the eleven standards documents (CHCF) does not explicitly mention EBLs. While the FL and ACF documents refer to EBLs in select places, the standards are not separated for PreK but rather bulked together for PreK-12, or by the end of grade 4. None of the standards documents reviewed addresses an identification process for EBLs that identify specific eligibility criteria, such as advising that the district administer a home language survey to new preschool students.

4.1.3.4 No mention of EBLs

Only one standard document—the CHCF—does not explicitly mention EBLs. This document is for PreK-12, or by the end of grade 5. The FL and ACF mention EBLs in select places, but do not distinguish standards for PreK, rather bulking them together for PreK-12, or by the end of grade 4.

4.1.3.5 EBLs mentioned in appendix or conclusion material

Eight of the eleven documents reviewed here distinctly mention EBLs in their appendices or conclusion material, however, EBLs are included tangentially, positioned at the margins as an afterthought to the dominant discourse on ELDS. These documents include: FL, GPLE, WIDA, SELAPL, STECF, ELAL, CFM, and HSSCF. Two documents (FL, HSSCF) define various

bilingual programs, and two documents (WIDA, SELAPL) define terms related to language development in the glossary. Four out of the eight documents (GPLE, STECF, ELAL, HSSCF) link EBLs with students with disabilities, either in the title to the Appendix referencing EBLs, or interwoven into the strategies for teaching EBLs and students with disabilities. Three out of the eight documents (ELAL, FL, HSSCF) emphasize the benefits of multilingualism, acknowledge that English language development must be integrated across classroom content, recognize the benefits of one's home language in supporting English language development, and/or offer resources or tools for educators working with EBLs. While several appendices represent thoughtfully crafted resources for educators on working with EBLs, the majority lump EBLs together with students with disabilities, and moreover are an afterthought added in the supplementary material as opposed to being carefully woven throughout the documents.

The FL references EBLs in Appendix A: Early Language Learning and Programs in the Elementary Grades. This appendix astutely acknowledges the benefits of early second language learning, citing brain and language research (p. 65). The appendix then defines foreign language in elementary school programs, immersion programs, and two-way immersion or two-way bilingual programs. However, the emphasis of this appendix is geared towards foreign language learning and not towards EBLs. The GPLE references EBLs in Appendix A of the document. The appendix states:

> Adaptations for Children with Disabilities: Note: These are just a few suggestions for adaptations. Consult more comprehensive resources to make sure the curriculum and classroom are adapted appropriately for children with different disabilities. Many of these strategies are also helpful for children without disabilities and for English language learners. (GPLE, p. 45)

This segue to the appendix contributes to a deficit view of EBL children's abilities, and lumps EBLs together with students with disabilities. EBLs are also considered tangentially, positioning

EBLs as needing to "adapt" to education as is, as opposed to the perspective that education needs to be reorganized to honor, cultivate, and sustain EBLs. Further, a subsection entitled "For children with language disabilities" offers strategies, including: "provide good models of communication (in any language)"; "provide opportunities for interaction with typically developing peers"; and "use a variety of symbols (tactual symbols, object symbols, picture symbols such as Mayer-Johnson pictures) around the room along with various printed materials that support children's primary languages while they are learning English (e.g., books, newspapers, magazines in the dramatic play area)" (p. 45). These strategies directly link EBLs with students with disabilities, both in the title of the subsection and then interwoven in the strategies themselves. The appendix directly references accessing language as a disability. In these appendices, EBLs are othered, pathologized, and conceptualized in terms of deficits according to the Eurocentric alignment of dominant approaches to early education.

The WIDA standards reference EBLs in Appendix A: Glossary, in vocabulary related to language development. The appendix defines vocabulary such as developmentally appropriate practice, dual language learners, early language development, home language, sociocultural context, and translanguaging (p. 64). The SELAPL references EBLs in the glossary of the document, defining dual language learners, culture, diversity, and home language (pp. 30-31).

The STECF references EBLs in Appendix II: Essential Role of Language, Literacy, and Mathematics for Science and Technology/Engineering Learning for All Students. This appendix is not exclusively directed towards EBLs, but select statements are relevant. For example, the appendix states that "creating an intentionally inclusive classroom culture relies on skilled facilitation that offers rich, rigorous learning opportunities accessible for all learners… Every student benefits from careful attention to language in STE instruction, including linguistically

diverse students and students with disabilities" (p. 123). Additionally, the appendix states that "for English language learners in particular, the focus is on the developmental nature of language and the careful use of instructional supports and scaffoldings so all students can participate in grade-level curricula and higher-order thinking" (p. 124). While this last statement aligns with research on scaffolding instructional supports for EBLs, it is noteworthy that the sentence that follows refers to students with disabilities, again conflating the two categories.

The ELAL references EBLs in Appendix A: Application of the Standards for English Learners and Students with Disabilities. The section on English Learners states that English learners should be held to the same high expectations as their peers, and that they may require additional time, support, and assessment, acknowledging the arduous path towards acquiring English language proficiency and content-area knowledge simultaneously. Further, the section explains the importance of collaboration and shared responsibility among educators and administrators for student language development and academic success. The appendix goes on to detail the language learning that occurs in Sheltered English Immersion (SEI) classrooms, and describes the resources available from ESE's Office of English Language Acquisition and Academic Achievement. Importantly, the appendix describes the diverse backgrounds and needs of EBLs, stating that English learners are a heterogeneous group and that each student requires instruction tailored to their individual needs, as well as continuous monitoring. The appendix also states that "ELs who are literate in a home language that shares cognates with English can apply home-language vocabulary knowledge when reading in English; likewise, those with extensive schooling can use conceptual knowledge developed in another language when learning academic content in English" (p. 156), acknowledging the benefits of one's home language in aiding second language acquisition, yet maintaining that the aim is to use home languages to

learn English rather than to sustain bilingual identities. These statements position EBLs as needing to adapt to the education system, which favors a dominant Eurocentric developmental agenda, as opposed to the education system honoring EBLs.

The ELAL lists six key principles for guiding instruction for EBLs, including, for example, leveraging home language, cultural assets, and prior knowledge, as well as having rigorous standards-aligned instruction that is grade-level appropriate and provides nuanced scaffolds. The appendix evidently values multilingualism and applies an asset-based stance to the academic, linguistic, and social benefits of multilingualism. The ELAL appendix thoughtfully describes the learning expectations for EBLs and places the onus on educators to prepare students for social and academic success. At the same time, EBLs and students with disabilities are lumped together in the same appendix, which begs the question of why English language learning continues to be perceived as a handicap through a deficit lens, and the underlying rationale for this pattern. The continued negative positioning of minoritized children through a deficit lens stigmatizes and disadvantages EBLs (Goodwin et al., 2008). The CFM references EBLs in Appendix I: Application of Standards for English Learners and Students with Disabilities. The language in the appendix is identical to that of the ELAL.

The HSSCF references EBLs in Appendix A: Application of the Standards for English Learners and Students with Disabilities. The language of this appendix is similar to that of the CFM and ELAL, but differs in its introduction and its explanation of types of dual language programs. The introduction, which recognizes EBLs' strengths, states:

> The vision of this framework is to prepare all students to evaluate competing ideas, to understand the past, and to promote the ideals of equality, justice, liberty, and the common good for all peoples in the world. English learners are among them. They are some of the most diverse students in the nation. They represent a range of cultural, linguistic, educational, and socioeconomic backgrounds and have many physical, social, emotional, and/or cognitive differences. They bring with them a wealth of assets, such as

> cultures and languages, as well as additional cognitive, social, emotional, political, and economic potential. (HSSCF, p. 189)

Additionally, the appendix includes definitions of SEI and ESL programs and two-way immersion programs. The appendix includes language on history and social science teaching practices that can support EBLs, including, for example, developing socially and culturally supportive classrooms, incorporating well-structured pair work, and providing explicit instruction in academic strategies to assist comprehension of challenging content. This appendix represents a well-rounded and thoughtfully crafted supplementary piece on supporting EBLs and, most importantly, it acknowledges the mutually beneficial relationship between one's native language and second language development.

4.1.4 Summary and analysis

The ELDS reviewed here represent a snapshot of EBL inclusion in Massachusetts state standards documents. Findings revealed that in general, EBL inclusion is inconsistent and limited to introductory or conclusion material, or otherwise scattered throughout the domains. None of the standards includes a separate EBL section within the early childhood guidelines. According to Espinosa and Calderón (2015), states should include within their ELDS detailed guidance on learning expectations and supports for EBLs. Espinosa and Calderón (2015) contend that a stated learning expectation alone does little to support a standard and even can cause more frustration and confusion when lacking detailed guidance. The superficial inclusion, or exclusion entirely, of EBLs across domains of development, as well as related guidance for educators, signals a need for policy revisions to ELDS that acknowledge EBLs' unique learning needs. Moreover, EBLs are positioned pathologically as needing to undergo processes of assimilation or adaptation, which can impair young children's sense of belonging and development.

The sheer number of documents and the lack of coordination across domains of development (see section 1.3c) indicate a need for consolidation of Massachusetts ELDS. The analysis also revealed that the documents variably depict EBLs through an asset-based lens, or a deficit one—which, in addition to viewing dual language learning as erroneously thwarting English language development—also views dual language learning from an English-dominant perspective that fails to honor children's diverse languages and cultures and the myriad ways in which children develop (see sections 1.3a, 1.3b, and 1.3c above). The WIDA E-ELD is the only standards document that addresses exclusively EBLs, and further, recognizes the English language power dynamics within schools and advocates for developmentally appropriate instructional materials for EBLs. Evidently, ELDS should more widely include EBLs in their introductory material, and the WIDA could be more broadly encouraged as a resource amongst educators.

The eleven ELDS reviewed here represent varying degrees of cultural and linguistic inclusivity, but there is room for improvement in better aligning the EBL terminology across the documents, as well as improved inclusion of EBLs in the introduction and conclusion material, language and literacy domains, and other domains such as social and emotional development, social studies, communication, the arts, and others described in sections 1.3a through 1.3e above. The analysis also revealed a need for greater emphasis on ELDS expectations for student outcomes and practices as they relate specifically to EBLs, given the finding that many documents include EBL references geared towards educators and putting the onus on educator practices towards EBLs (see section 1.2 above).

Further, there is a need to better distinguish between the unique learning patterns of EBLs and those for students with disabilities, as opposed to the persistent tangle of the two categories.

EBLs are often positioned as needing to "adapt" to education, as opposed to the perspective that education should honor and cultivate EBLs' cultures and linguistic repertoires. This pathological positioning views EBLs from a deficit perspective within a Eurocentric, dominant culture framing of development, which undermines EBLs' knowledge and skills. EBLs' use of "academic" language is emphasized, calling into question what is "appropriate" academic or social language use (Valdés, 2001). It is also notable that the SELAPL and WIDA are the only Massachusetts ELDS for PreK teachers that are translated into Spanish, Portuguese, Haitian Creole, and Chinese. All other documents reviewed here are available in English only. Given the diversity among preschool educators in the state, and in Boston in particular, these documents could be more accessible to teachers if they are made available in multiple languages.

It is also important to consider the possibility that the latent content within the six documents published in between the 2002 Question 2 legislation—banning bilingual education—and the 2017 LOOK Act—amending Question 2 (GPLE, WIDA, SELAPL, STECF, ELAL, CFM) is a product of their times, and could reflect the political and linguistic agenda of that time, even though they are still in use today. Indeed, with the exception of the WIDA standards, the remaining five ELDS published in this time period link EBLs together with students with disabilities in some capacity, perhaps reflecting the perpetuation of a heritage language deficit ideology. Indeed, one policy expert conveyed that the standards at the time of the Question 2 legislation probably did not consider EBLs and they were just "thinking about the typical kid" as well as monolingual English-speaking teachers. Finally, a review of the Massachusetts EEC Dual Language Education Policies and Guidelines document, developed in 2010, reveals a need for this document to be updated given the legislative and policy changes within the state in the last decade, changes to teacher qualifications, and the changing demographic.

4.2 Findings Related to Research Question 2: How do preschool teachers in different Boston public preschool program types (general education, SEI, dual language) perceive the relationships between Massachusetts' language policy, ELDS, and the needs of their young EBL students?

The second research question aimed to uncover how teachers made sense of the relationships among policy, standards, and EBLs. Several themes surfaced among participants as a response to this research question, including: teacher autonomy; language hierarchy; K1 school choice; comments on Question 2; and comments on the 2017 LOOK Act. An overarching theme emerged that revealed a toxic political climate for EBLs that undermined their funds of knowledge, denied their freedom of expression, and threatened their academic careers. The negative aftershocks of Question 2, coupled with the political climate under the Trump administration, permeated the sociocultural fabric of schools. By and large, findings from interviews with teachers exposed an environment in which teachers struggled to abide by school policy and legislation, while behind closed doors they tried to do what they felt was best for children and allow their students freedom of expression. Despite teachers' efforts, interviews conveyed that the undermining of EBLs' language and identity is so engrained in the sociopolitical landscape that it has contributed to the polarization of language learners, impacted families' perspectives of native language maintenance, and contributed to an era of fear and paranoia among immigrant families.

4.2.1 Teacher autonomy

Four of the six teachers (one DLL, two general education, one SEI) relayed how they assert their autonomy as classroom teachers to make decisions that work for their students, despite laws or mandates dictating otherwise. For example, one dual language teacher explained

that she does what she wants in her classroom "until someone tells [her] otherwise," and a general education teacher similarly said, "go ahead [and] do your law, but I'm going to give the kids what they need to become a success. I might be in trouble about that, but that's how I feel." This notion of teachers ignoring particular mandates was also reflected in one policy expert's reflection of the impact of Question 2 on teachers (see section 5.12), recalling how teachers would close their classroom doors and support students in their native language until a visitor came to observe, at which point they would switch to English.

4.2.2 Language hierarchy

Two teachers (one DLL, one SEI) made noteworthy references towards a language hierarchy that polarizes language learners into two categories: those learning English as a second language and monolingual English speakers who speak and understand only one language. Consistent with the literature (Cervantes-Soon, 2014; Valdés, 1997) monolingual English speakers are often praised for attaining bilingual status when they study a language other than English, while paradoxically the language achievement expectations for students learning English as a second language are much lower. One dual language teacher explained how, while the mission of her school is to serve a disadvantaged group of students who will struggle in English-speaking kindergarten, other schools have a bilingual mission for a monolingual English-speaking student population, which "puts you in a better place in the world." This teacher referenced the language power dynamics within bilingual school models and their respective missions according to the student population.

The dual language teacher also compellingly argued that the EBL children who could really benefit long-term from dual language programs do not have equitable access to this type of model as children in communities "whose wealthy, well-resourced parents knew they wanted it

and then had the resources to fight for it," further explaining, in whisper, that they "want a bilingual kid, you know?" This subtle undertone of a whisper demonstrates an understanding of the nuances surrounding the double standards for monolingual English speakers and minoritized EBLs, and is also an example of not enacting agency in questioning this injustice, for in whispering the teacher silences an uncomfortable reality. An SEI teacher echoed these same concerns over what she called a "double standard" for language learning that places a higher value on learning a second language for monolingual English speakers. From her perspective, higher socioeconomic towns can be more supportive of and better able to promote and fund dual language programs, which "will give an edge to their children in later on applying to the best universities and having the best opportunities for jobs." However, she lamented how "it doesn't mean it's going to benefit students of lower socioeconomic places." This language hierarchy perpetuates a value system that praises second language learning for monolingual English speakers, while at the same time undermines learning opportunities for EBL children as well as their native language capabilities.

4.2.3 K1 school attendance and EBL enrollment form

Four teachers (two DLL, one general education, one SEI) referenced challenges that arose in their classrooms due to Boston's K1 school selection process, whereby a seat in a specific classroom is designated to a particular child regardless of their actual attendance. One dual language teacher explained that the K1 seats are coveted and therefore parents are unlikely to give up their spot regardless of where their child is placed, but at the same time, parents may choose to leave the seat empty and not send their child if they are dissatisfied with their school designation, or unaware of the benefits of ECE and treat PreK as optional daycare. She describes this as perhaps a confusion for parents who may not want their child in a dual language

classroom and may not understand why their child was placed there. A general education and SEI teacher both echoed this challenge with attendance; a general education teacher stated that sometimes seats are left open all year because the schools leave a number of spots open for children with IEPs who age out of early intervention, but they may not arrive until March, leaving a spot empty that entire time for someone who could have benefited from that seat. She lamented a school choice system that guarantees a seat regardless of attendance:

> Sometimes parents won't even send them because they don't want this school. I've had parents sitting at home with their kids for months, and then finally they brought them, and they were like well we were waiting for such and such a school to open. And you're like well for four months some other kid could have been here the whole time. (General Education Teacher Interview, 2020)

An SEI teacher expressed a challenge with attendance and convincing parents to come to school every day, explaining that many parents treat K1 like "daycare" because it's "not mandatory." Both teachers had trouble convincing families to send their children to school regularly and treat K1 as an essential part of formal education to provide a strong foundation for early learning. There are both policy problems with the attendance reserves, as well as problems with parents choosing not to send their children.

Relatedly, several teachers commented on flaws of the initial enrollment form that determines a child's school placement and whether they are assessed on their English language abilities or assumed to be English-proficient. This problem stems from the social expectations of parents that affect how they complete the form. According to one dual language teacher:

> I'll have kids who, I'm like, I know you're not a strong English speaker but your parent marked that it's English-English, your first two languages, because that's what they think the right answer is, so. That's cultural, right? That's a reaction to the way our country is going to treat you if you speak Spanish. But then they could miss out on services, especially if they're not in a dual language program. (DLL Teacher Interview, 2020)

A general education teacher echoed these same concerns in stating that "some of them have listed themselves as being English with their first language being English when they signed up," saying that despite getting parents to switch them, they still are not getting the services they need until K2. Due to parents' language choices on this form, a student may be misidentified as a monolingual English speaker, consequently missing out on essential services. This omission of a child's native language is a reflection of parental value accorded to dual language programs and the stigma associated with bilingualism.

4.2.4 Perspectives of Question 2

Five teachers shared their perspectives on Question 2, the "Unz initiative," and the perceived effects of this legislation on students, teachers, and schools, with everyone underscoring the negative impacts of the overarching political climate under the Trump administration as well as the language politics of Question 2. One dual language teacher equated needing a special waiver to become a dual language program—a requirement under Question 2—as being just like "putting poor people in jail for not paying a bail," saying that it's "really no way to help anybody." Another dual language teacher explained that the students—particularly older students—at the school only want to speak in English, "and if they're in a society that wanted them just to speak in English, it's making [the students'] work more difficult." Teachers responded to the influences of a long-term social and political climate that values English first and disparages native language development. An SEI teacher stated that Question 2 hurt EBLs more than it benefited them, explaining that she would not be surprised if there were a high dropout rate amongst EBLs given that they are in a discouraging setting. She continued to describe how Question 2 has created a challenging environment for EBLs where "they go to a classroom where not even their teacher looks like them and can't understand, so it's frustrating.

So a child can come to school for seven hours and not hear their first language. But we expect them to learn."

Teachers identified a conflict between the language politics of Question 2 coupled with a political climate that vilifies immigrants under the Trump administration, and the realities of their diverse classroom makeups and EBLs' needs. One general education teacher stated:

> I feel like, alright, they had all these laws and theories, all these people who have a board and think that they are savior of the children are telling us. And then there's the reality of being in the classroom and what you can give your children. (General Education Teacher Interview, 2020)

She continued to say "I want all these people who are making the law, come and spend a half day with me. Come and spend a half day with me and then you tell me if some of your laws make sense. That's all I want." From her perspective, individuals in political positions of power were detached from the realities of the classroom and what was developmentally appropriate, much like Rogoff (2003) explains that individuals in positions of power assume their own developmental trajectories to be the norm, excluding those held by non-dominant, ethnically and linguistically minoritized individuals. The individuals in power who promoted or implemented Question 2 were most likely unaffected by the legislation itself, while imposing it on marginalized students. An SEI teacher revealed that she originally did not want to participate in this study because of questions surrounding Question 2. She explained that the political climate was very damaging and demonizing towards EBLs, and she was extremely emotional in stating:

> I identify with the parents and the families, and things can change so fast [cries]. And now with the president we have [cries]... it is not really an environment that's conductive to bilingualism, multiculturalism, not for people who are poor and immigrants, like undocumented immigrants… the political climate, you know, it's worrisome… it also is not just a matter of if you are an immigrant but what kind of an immigrant you are, what is your community like, what is your socioeconomic place in this country. (SEI teacher interview, 2020)

She underscored how the students who really could have benefited probably did not have the same access to this type of programing as children in wealthier communities whose parents had the resources and wherewithal to fight for it.

Several teachers also spoke about the impact of Question 2 on teachers. An SEI teacher explained how she believed that Question 2 "discouraged a lot of the Latino teachers" and said she would not be surprised if the current Latinx teacher force decreased. She lamented the loss of her culture in the school and how Latinx teachers do not get replaced by other Latinxs, saying "you are on your own, you really are," despite the high percentage of Latinx kids in the school. On the other hand, another SEI teacher explained how Question 2 furthered her conviction that she should work as a teacher to support EBLs in this time of heightened need. She also recalled a Spanish-speaking teacher in a bilingual class losing her job after Question 2 and how, as an immigrant there is always an air of uncertainty about what will happen next. She affirmed that if the public schools really want to support minoritized communities and cultures, more teachers and paraprofessionals from different backgrounds need to be hired for those jobs.

4.2.5 Perspectives of LOOK Act

Half of the teachers (one DLL, one SEI, one general education) were familiar with the LOOK Act of 2017. They were divided over feeling optimistic about the mission and scope of the legislation and how it may positively influence education for EBLs, and cautious over how the legislation may manifest. One dual language teacher conveyed that the LOOK Act acknowledges the important work of teachers of dual language models, and she hoped that this legislation would impart on students a sense of pride in their bilingualism and would give them a leg up once they enter the workforce. An SEI teacher reported feeling "cautious" over the new legislation and worried that the funds would ultimately support students in higher socioeconomic

and well-resourced towns, as opposed to places with higher immigrant populations. She stated: "We'll see what happens. I think that initiative is going to work well for well-to-do communities because their kids will get the benefit of bilingual education, but it's not going to work for the people who need it most." Participants expressed mixed emotions over the possible benefits for students from increased dual language programming that could stem from the LOOK Act, coupled with a fear that the funds would go to well-resourced communities and not those who could benefit the most. A summary analysis of similarities and differences across program types is described below following the findings from Research Question 3, in sections 4.1 and 4.2 respectively.

4.3 Findings Related to Research Question 3: To what extent do preschool teachers in different Boston public preschool program types (general education, SEI, dual language) report utilizing ELDS to scaffold the learning and development of EBLs:

4.3.1 What are teachers' reported attitudes and perceptions regarding using ELDS?

The third research question explored how teachers reported feeling about ELDS, their preparation to use standards, and ultimately their use of ELDS in the classroom, with particular attention to their EBL students. The first part of this question attempted to document how teachers conveyed their attitudes and perceptions regarding ELDS. Several themes surfaced among participants as a response to this research question, including: being knowledgeable about ELDS; holding a perception of negative impacts of ELDS; and reporting a discrepancy between ELDS and expectations. The overarching theme that emerged across responses (described in more detail below) revealed that by and large, teachers were knowledgeable about ELDS and believed that they were important teaching tools, but at the same time they expressed concern

over the academic pushdown of expectations on K1, which felt burdensome, developmentally inappropriate, and created undue stress on children.

4.3.1.1 Knowledgeable about ELDS

Five of the six teachers (two DLL, two general education, one SEI) expressed confidence in their knowledge of the various ELDS. All participants conveyed they had a general sense of where students needed to be and didn't necessarily refer to the ELDS constantly. One SEI teacher said:

> I just know. I look at the standards and I say okay so let me see how do I do that. Standards are kind of dry, you know [laughs]? But, to me it's very important to be creative and read in between the lines and see what to apply where. (SEI Teacher Interview, 2020)

Even without regularly referring to the ELDS, teachers conveyed confidence in their understanding of where they wanted their students to be in terms of skill attainment by the end of the year in order to be prepared for K2.

Four of the six teachers (two DLL, one general education, one SEI) reported that they were happy with the ELDS and saw them as important tools to guide their instruction in the classroom. One dual language teacher said: "I like them, I really like being able to at least look back on stuff that's like, I think they're pretty relevant. I'm glad." She continued to say: "I'm definitely, I get it. I like them. I'm not anti-standards, I'm anti-high-stakes testing of them, and I think people just need to have more autonomy and time to use them to design curriculum." A general education teacher stated: "I mean I feel that because the standards are what's expected that the child will learn, that has to be part of what you're teaching them because you don't want them to go to K2 and only know how to sing a song or something like that." The majority of teachers explained that they understood ELDS and their purpose in guiding instruction.

4.3.1.2 Perception of negative impacts of ELDS

Several teachers (one DLL, one general education, one SEI) reported negative impacts of ELDS and specifically the burden of implementing ELDS within the education accountability system. A dual language teacher was dissatisfied with the emphasis on student data collection, stating that it causes stress, eliminates beneficial social-emotional learning time, and "they think pushing the standards higher will somehow fix the problems." This same dual language teacher worried about the negative impacts of emphasizing ELDS on her recently arrived EBL students who may have experienced trauma. She stated:

> One of the boys in my class's big brother almost drowned in the Rio Grande last year. His mom told me this on the second day of school and, I mean it makes me tear up saying it now. So you imagine it's like how can you be judging this school off of the scores that these kids are getting on the tests, you know? They just got here and what's the first thing you're going to do after you've traveled across the entire continent? You're not going to be like oh let's get on these reading standards, let's make sure you can find the central idea between these three passages. How is that your priority? (DLL Teacher Interview, 2020)

A general education teacher similarly conveyed that the heightened focus on ELDS caused undue stress on children. She said: "We're in a world where everybody's gotta be on this page at this age. If there was one thing that I could change, is that. Because you're four you need to do this, or because you're five. Let's relax. Let that child develop." She continued to underscore the academic pushdown linked with ELDS, stating:

> So I feel like a lot of the stuff that we do in K1 should be what they're doing in K2, a lot of the stuff that K2 are doing, should be what they're doing in first grade. But because we've pushed everything, you know, we have to have high expectations. Then why are four-year-olds stressed? Because we're talking about parallelograms [laughs]. (General Education Teacher Interview, 2020)

An SEI teacher also reflected that a lot of progress monitoring "takes away from you really sitting down and listening to what the kids are saying, how they're playing, how they're interacting with each other." These teachers all emphasized the theme of stress on children and

teachers due to the academic pushdown of ELDS, consistent with Rogoff's (1990) argument that the haste to teach academic preschool is based on the cultural community of the dominant group in society and does not reflect minoritized backgrounds and cultures.

4.3.1.3 Discrepancy between ELDS and developmentally appropriate expectations

Four of the six teachers (two DLL, one general education, one SEI) reported a perceived discrepancy between the ELDS and their own developmentally appropriate expectations for their students. For example, one dual language teacher said in a whisper: "I can argue I'm doing the right thing it's just that a lot of times what happens in these situations is they want even the youngest kids to act older, like be schooled as though they're older like that's going to help them, which it's not [whispers]." With regard to the standards, the same teacher noted:

> I don't mind the [standards] I use, but I definitely think that there needs to be more look at developmental appropriateness… like there's, the reading levels in kindergarten go up almost every year, the expectation. And I don't think humans evolve that quickly [laughs] like I don't think our brains change that fast that next year kids will be able to read faster or sooner. (DLL Teacher Interview, 2020)

Another dual language teacher expressed the opinion that "the district one [ELDS] is demanding more than what a child should be doing according to the Massachusetts standards," suggesting that the expectations within the district's progress report do not align with the ELDS.

One general education teacher similarly conveyed that the ELDS did not match the developmental expectations for children, stating: "What you can't do is spend all day teaching things that children can't do. So some of those standards I think are going to need an awful lot of groundwork to get there." This same teacher stated:

> Some of the PreK ones are so low, and then some of them just seem unobtainable. I would probably raise some up and pull some down a little bit, and make them more age appropriate. You know the PreK math is only like count to ten. And then there's some about text and inferring and books when you're just like, how would I teach this? (General Education Teacher Interview, 2020)

These teachers all shared the sentiment that many of the ELDS are developmentally inappropriate for young children, underscoring Rogoff's (2007) metaphor of a racetrack to describe the rush to teach young children as premised on the institutions of the cultural majority.

4.3.2 How have they been prepared to use ELDS in their instruction, both generally and specifically for EBLs?

The second part of this question looked at how teachers have been prepared to use ELDS and to work with EBLs. Half of the teachers reported receiving prior education on working with EBLs, and only one teacher reported receiving in-service education on working with EBLs. Only two teachers reported receiving prior education on working with ELDS, while nearly all teachers reported receiving in-service education—ranging from infrequent to intensive—on working with ELDS. With regards to professional development, most teachers described a need for more support with applying ELDS to EBLs and with ELDS implementation, as well as a desire for a "professional learning community" to share helpful strategies.

4.3.2.1 Prior education on EBLs

Three teachers (two SEI and one general education) reported receiving prior pre-service education on working with EBLs, either through a workshop or ESL master's or license, while the other three teachers (two DLL and one general education) reported not receiving prior pre-service education on working with EBLs. One dual language teacher explained that "everything I know about dual language is just from working here," and the other dual language teacher described it as "still just learning on the go." One general education teacher explained that she didn't "remember us doing a lot about bilingual education." Vygotsky's sociocultural theory of learning affirms that language and culture play a central role in children's development, and consequently should be emphasized in all teacher education coursework. Teachers' reported lack

of experiences working with EBLs in their pre-service programs is indicative of a need to closely examine teacher education. Pre-service programs should address approaches to meeting the needs of an increasingly culturally and linguistically diverse sub-set of the population.

4.3.2.2 In-service education on EBLs

Of the six teachers, only one general education teacher recalled receiving in-service professional development on working with EBLs several years ago through a trainer that the principal brought in, in addition to the WIDA professional development she receives every year. On the contrary, the other five teachers reported that they do not receive in-service professional development or district education on working with EBLs. One dual language teacher reported receiving professional development from the district in the K1 curriculum but not in dual language, stating that "we don't really do anything particular for DL" and "it's definitely standards-based but it's not dual language based and it's not the most beneficial way to use the time or the data." She explained how dual language teachers formed a union group to develop their own conference, stating that "that's probably good evidence for how much PD we get around here that we had to make it ourselves [laughs]." The other dual language teacher, confirming again that the interview was confidential, confided that "the district does not understand dual language education" and that they have "no idea what we do here." An SEI teacher recalled how there was much more support two decades ago, but now "you're on your own, you really are on your own." She offered the example of having a coach come in three years ago from the English language department, "and she's like and I'm going to come in, I'm going to work with you, etc. and then she disappeared, never came back [laughs]." These examples demonstrate a lack of professional development on working with EBLs, which can hold consequences for supporting linguistic diversity. Supporting linguistic diversity requires

teachers to embrace and sustain multilingualism by learning about their students' communicative practices and engaging in translanguaging to support learning and cultural competence (Souto-Manning et al., 2019).

4.3.2.3 Prior education on ELDS

Two teachers (one DLL and one general education) reported receiving prior education on working with ELDS. One dual language teacher exclaimed: "Oh my God, I would say that's probably what they get you with the most, oh my God that's all we did. I think that's what they push a lot, it's like breaking down the standards, breaking down the standards." A general education teacher similarly explained: "Oh my gosh, that was all, standards and all that was huge. It was huge." On the other hand, four teachers (one DLL, one general education, two SEI) reported limited to no prior education on using ELDS. The other dual language teacher explained that while she did have to show that she was using the standards, she was not taught "how to draw the instruction out of it" and she didn't "recall any class teaching [her] how to do it." One SEI teacher explained: "I don't recall working with the standards, it was more like here, in house." The majority of teachers reported limited to no prior preparation on ELDS, indicating a need to explore teacher preparation programs to understand how developmental benchmarks are introduced.

4.3.2.4 District education on ELDS

Five of the six teachers (all but one SEI teacher) reported receiving in-service professional development on working with ELDS, with the educational opportunities ranging from infrequent to intensive. One SEI teacher recalled being "bombarded" with professional development, saying that she often works on ELDS as part of a team while developing lessons. A dual language teacher similarly stated that professional development emphasizes

"conceptualizing how to break [the standards] down into steps." On the other hand, another dual language teacher said she did receive one professional development opportunity on ELDS, but it was more than five years ago and was not mandatory. One general education teacher explained that because their math scores fell, they're "having a much larger push on the standards, are you using them, can you justify what you're using, I want to see what you're teaching and where that standard is." Only one SEI teacher asserted that she did not receive in-service professional development or education on ELDS, explaining: "None. It's something that you're left on your own to find the support that you need. I don't think there's enough training." While the majority of participants reported receiving in-person professional development on working with ELDS, the opportunities for educators varied widely, from infrequent to "bombarded," suggesting a need to look closer at what the workshops entail.

4.3.2.5 Goals for professional development

All six teachers shared their thoughts on the ways in which professional development opportunities would be most beneficial. Four teachers (two DLL and two general education) described a need for more support with ELDS, including breaking down the ELDS by language needs for EBLs, and more support with ELDS implementation. One dual language teacher explained that she would like the ELDS interpreted specifically for EBLs, looking at "what does this sound like in Spanish, what does this sound like in English, at what grade will they be able to do that. So just looking at it relevantly to us would be more helpful than just in isolation." Another dual language teacher described the challenges with teaching the skill of the standard and the content, wondering "how much and how we combine both to dedicate at a time," something she believes could be helped by professional development. A general education teacher revealed needing support in actually implementing ELDS as opposed to discussing them

theoretically, stating "show me in terms of that standard, what should happen to make that a success? Don't make me just come read it. I've read it a million times already, don't make me sit and listen to you." Another general education teacher described a lack of ongoing support for linking ELDS implementation with the curriculum, explaining that "it's kind of like, you're in a room with these children and you need to figure out how to do it."

Two teachers (one DLL and one SEI) described their desire for a "professional learning community" in which teachers could share—according to the dual language teacher—"what's been successful, what hasn't" and "best practices and then at the same time looking at what the different learning goals are." The SEI teacher similarly reminisced about how teachers used to meet before school on a regular basis but they no longer meet due to extended day and the extra demands on teachers, describing how teachers are now "all exhausted, we're all overwhelmed, we're burned out." This teacher craved the morning gatherings before school that she previously had with her colleagues, "just to have someone that you can go to and bounce ideas or have that community, which doesn't really exist. Everybody is too busy. The demands are higher and these long hours don't help." Other professional development desires included support for effectively implementing small group interventions, external validation or "reassurance" that teachers are doing their job well, communicating ELDS and expectations to parents, and support for teachers with implementing a self-care practice to prevent burnout, thereby honoring teachers' humanity.

4.3.3 How do they report using ELDS in their instruction?

The third part of this question looked at how teachers have reported using ELDS in their instruction. Themes ranged from teachers explaining how they use ELDS in the classroom, how they evaluate EBLs' progress, and the role of the paraprofessional. The majority of teachers reported that they do not look at ELDS on a regular basis, but most expressed being comfortable

with the content of ELDS. Half of the teachers expressed frustration in the number of assessments they have to administer to their EBLs, which they explained took away from getting to know the children and actually teaching. Half of the teachers explained the importance of informal assessments in evaluating EBLs' progress. The majority of teachers also discussed the important role that the paraprofessional plays in successfully teaching their EBLs and in supporting the teacher throughout daily activities.

4.3.3.1 Teacher use of ELDS

All six teachers discussed the ways in which they use and interact with ELDS. Four of the six teachers (two general education teachers, one DLL, and one SEI teacher) reported that they do not look at ELDS on a regular basis. One dual language teacher explained:

> So all the lessons that we have that are developed by the district all have the reference to which standard they go with in the common core, in the big chunk, so I do use them, but by default. I don't really go back there too often myself. I guess my most common interaction with the standards would just be the rubric that I use that they made with those standards. I just stick to the rubric. (DLL Teacher Interview, 2020)

Similarly, a general education teacher explained:

> I know what the standards are and what I need to do. For example the writing, we do have a writing rubric that's based on the standards. But the standards themselves, I feel like I'm not really looking at them on a regular basis, because I've been doing it for so long I pretty much know a lot of what they are, so yeah, we have to make sure they're in the level or whatever, so we do do that. But it's not, I don't really have that book out [laughs]. (General Education Teacher Interview, 2020)

She continued to explain that "it is part of what we teach in school, but it's not like we're going to look at it every day and say oh, am I incorporating that." An SEI teacher said: "I'm rolling my eyes [laughs]. I'm supposed to write them on the board, right. But that's just so tiresome." Of the remaining two out of six teachers, one dual language teacher reported that she bases her use of ELDS off of her own learning experiences, and one SEI teacher reported that she constantly refers to ELDS in her practice, explaining that "we're always putting up standards [on the board]

as we're doing the different lessons." This SEI teacher described the amount of time spent "organizing the materials because it's a lot of preparation that is involved. So it's not something that you can shoot from your hip, no no."

4.3.3.2 Evaluating EBLs' progress

All six teachers discussed the ways in which they evaluate EBLs' progress. Two dual language teachers reported that they use checklists to evaluate EBL student progress. One dual language teacher explained:

> Because right now it's very old school for the better, find a better word. It's more like do they know the sound? [Laughs]. It's very methodical, you know? It's almost like check he knows it or he doesn't know it. And we are not using currently anything culturally relevant to assess the learning. It's more mechanical, I don't know how to explain. (DLL Teacher Interview, 2020)

One dual language teacher reported using a mobile phone application to upload student work and evaluate progress. While several other teachers reported using phone apps for parent communication, only one teacher used an app as an evaluation tool. Three teachers (two general education and one SEI) reported using informal assessments to evaluate EBL student progress. One general education teacher stated:

> I just want to make sure that they're saying back or doing back, without me being there. Like I get a lot of the families said, oh my God he or she came home and they were talking about parallelograms or something, so the informal observation I think is so important. (General Education Teacher Interview, 2020)

An SEI teacher similarly explained:

> When I give a whole class lesson, you know are they participating, are they speaking in full sentences? 'Cause we look for that. How do they speak with their peers, are they using the vocabulary that is being taught? So it's a lot of informal assessment that goes on. (SEI Teacher Interview, 2020)

Three teachers (one DLL, one general education, and one SEI) lamented the large number of assessments that they have to annually administer to their EBLs. A dual language

teacher explained: “So that’s a total of five different tests for four-year-olds. So that’s hard. And they are done one-by-one [laughs].” Similarly, an SEI teacher said:

> I’m finding that we’re starting to do a lot of testing again. And it’s hard because the kids, you need data and I believe in data. But everything cannot be data. You can’t be collecting data data [repeats for emphasis], you know, once you collect data then you have to do something with the data, so you have to be able to teach. (SEI Teacher Interview, 2020)

She continued to explain that the testing takes away from “getting to know the kids” and that:

> When you have to do a lot of progress monitoring and stuff it just takes away from you really sitting down and listening to what the kids are saying, how they’re playing, how they’re interacting with each other. It just takes you away from it because the tests are long, and you have to test them individually, and there’s really not enough time in the day to accomplish everything that they want. (SEI Teacher Interview, 2020)

In summary, half of the teachers found that informal assessments were the most helpful way to evaluate student progress, but they were also disheartened by the number of formal assessments they had to administer to their students, which undermined teachers’ classroom autonomy. Administering many formal assessments contradicts Vygotsky’s (1978) theory of scaffolding, where teachers build upon a child’s preexisting knowledge. Teachers do not have the time in their schedules each day to effectively scaffold unless formal assessments make way for more informal assessments, which would allow for teacher autonomy in addressing language and cultural diversity in their instruction and assessments.

4.3.3.3 Role of the paraprofessional

Five of the six teachers (two SEI, two general education, one DLL) discussed the important role that the paraprofessional plays in successfully teaching their EBLs. One dual language teacher said that “paraprofessionals are key to the success of our day. So we need them to be on the same page.” A general education teacher said: “You can do so much when you have a para, a good one. Otherwise you’re getting through half the curriculum, because you’re

spending most of the time giving out water and using the bathroom." On the other hand, one SEI teacher explained that the help from a para is largely dependent on their status as part-time or full-time, and their experience and education.

Another SEI teacher complained that her para did not speak Spanish, the children's native language, and this became frustrating for both the para and the students. She explained that this "causes frustration on both sides" and that she has to step in "constantly, which becomes frustrating because then I feel like I'm doing both jobs, and trying to keep the peace, trying to keep the calmness." While this SEI teacher lamented the lack of help from the para, it is evident from most of the teachers' comments that the para typically plays an important role in supporting the teacher and students alike.

4.3.4 How do they report using ELDS to address linguistic and cultural diversity?

The fourth part of this question looked at how teachers reported using ELDS to address linguistic and cultural diversity. The majority of teachers were English language learners themselves and conveyed that this gave them unique insight into how children learn language and of the importance of linguistic and cultural inclusion in their instruction. Relatedly, the majority of teachers explained that it was important for teachers to be able to communicate with children and families in their native language in order to effectively teach them. Most teachers also described school environments that cultivated negative viewpoints towards EBLs or bilingualism, which led to feelings of isolation for teachers and fighting an uphill battle. Additionally, all teachers reported that it was challenging to understand and diagnose a language barrier versus a disability, and most consulted with school specialists to determine whether a child needed additional help. Use of mobile phone applications was found to be a critical communication tool with families of EBLs. Finally, the majority of teachers explained the extent

to which they felt knowledgeable about families' backgrounds or struggled to connect with families, which demonstrates that the ways that teachers understand and get to know families may be connected to their instructional practices.

4.3.4.1 Influence of teacher background on teaching practices

Four of the six teachers (one general education, two SEI, one DLL) learned English as a second language or were immigrants to the United States, and they each referenced how their own background influenced their teaching of EBLs. According to these teachers, being an immigrant or second language learner greatly influenced their understanding of children's language development and experiences. One SEI teacher explained:

> I think the fact that I myself am Hispanic, born and raised here, I can relate to them and they can relate to, 'cause we speak the same language, we can talk about the same food and things like that. And also the things that I bring to the class, like the materials is [*sic*] something that they will probably have at home. (SEI Teacher Interview, 2020)

Another SEI teacher was deeply emotional while speaking about her experience as an immigrant to the United States and how that has affected her teaching. She explained:

> I became a teacher because I was an immigrant mother and my son was an immigrant student, and I wanted to be involved because I really don't want my students to feel like—my son to feel like—he doesn't belong here [voice breaks, cries]. And also I felt like I wanted to advocate for my son and to represent the immigrant people in this educational system because I think this is very important [voice breaks, cries]. When I came here I realized how important this is and I felt like in [year redacted] when I first came and I didn't speak English and I wanted to volunteer and I knew that I had experience—like academic experience and knowledge of how to learn another language—it was hard for me to volunteer even on the bilingual Spanish side of his class because I didn't feel there were opportunities for me. To me that's the most important part. So we can work on inviting parents to come and volunteer and making them feel really genuinely respected and that we wish them to come, you know? So this way, students understand that we're connecting the culture and the language. (SEI Teacher Interview, 2020)

One dual language teacher shared how criticism of her English accent as a pre-service education student informed her desire to instill pride in her students in their bilingualism. She explained:

> Even me teaching in English, I was doing my practicum, which was a lovely experience but I was pretty aware that my mentor teacher didn't want me to teach the phonics part of the lesson because my pronunciation was not American. Yeah she believed that I was not able to teach that. It hurts, though we have to move on and I was always thinking you know what, I might not be able to pronounce whatever the "th" correctly but I speak two languages, what do you speak? [Laughs]. So it's what we are teaching our students, to be proud of being bilingual. (DLL Teacher Interview, 2020)

Further, the immigrant experience influenced several teachers' ability to authentically communicate with parents and create a welcoming classroom environment for families. One SEI teacher shared that when she came here as an immigrant, the only volunteer experience she was offered in her son's classroom was opening and closing the front door. She was deeply offended by this experience and now as a teacher makes a concerted effort to authentically involve parents in the classroom as volunteers, regularly participating in activities such as making pupusas with the kids and reading stories in Spanish.

4.3.4.2 Teachers' ability to communicate in child's native language

Similar to the discussion of teachers' backgrounds, four of the six teachers (two DLL, two SEI) referenced the importance of being able to communicate with children and families in their native languages, while one general education teacher believed that teachers did not need to be able to communicate in a child's native language in order to effectively teach them. This teacher explained:

> So I don't have any Cape Verdean kids in my classroom, and that's my background, right? But if I'm a good teacher, I should be able to teach all of these cultures, right I shouldn't only be teaching my culture, the strategies that I learn in getting my education, my certification all that stuff, should be able to play across culture [*sic*], right? (General Education Teacher Interview, 2020)

At the same time, all dual language and SEI teachers strongly conveyed the need for teachers to speak in a child's native language, echoing Vygotsky's sociocultural theory of learning affirming that language and culture play a central role in children's development. One SEI teacher said:

> I truly believe that in order for the dual language to be successful, the educator has to know the first child's language and their culture. Because in SEI, in my case, the first language of each of my students is Spanish, and when you don't know the language it makes it really, it's frustrating for the child and also for the teacher to know what they want and what they need. So I think it's important that if you really truly want to do it successfully, the teacher needs to represent the child's culture and also the language. I think that's essential. (SEI Teacher Interview, 2020)

Another SEI teacher spoke about the importance of learning some important phrases in the child's native language, even if you yourself cannot speak the language.

4.3.4.3 Negative language or attitudes towards EBLs

Four of the six teachers (two DLL, two SEI) referenced the external negative language or attitudes towards EBLs that they witness in their school environments or in society. For example, one dual language teacher stated:

> I hear teachers too and they don't say it in a big political way like that, but I definitely still hear among really well-educated, smart teachers that it's crazy that they'd be learning in Spanish when they should learn English sooner [whispers]. Yeah, and I know they don't mean it in a racist way, or in like an English is better than Spanish way, it's just I think people who aren't bilingual or haven't learned a second language don't understand, they don't think it's possible to be learning, for it to work out. They just don't believe it. But if your brain's never learned a second language, I just feel like, they don't understand the cognitive development that goes along with it. (DLL Teacher Interview, 2020)

This teacher's whispered emphasis on other teachers questioning the value of bilingualism acknowledges underlying language power dynamics that speak to larger sociopolitical inequities for bilingual and immigrant children. In whispering, she demonstrates a lack of agency, as she attempts to conceal reality by not fully voicing her concerns over these

inequities. This teacher further explained that in her school "no matter what happens people blame it on dual language. Because no matter what other little thing went wrong around it, I know so many teachers who just are going to say well do you think it's maybe because they learned in Spanish first?" In these examples, the teacher's colleagues believe that the school should prioritize learning English for children, a conviction consistent with a larger societal trend which erroneously assumes that developing one's native language first will then deter English language development. In these examples, dual language learning is a scapegoat for any problem in the school, signaling a trend of contempt for programs that encourage native language development. This dual language teacher also explained that monolingual teachers at her school were threatened by bilingual teachers, describing a "tension" and "bitterness" towards bilingual teachers over a fear that they could lose their jobs due to a lack of bilingualism. This teacher explained how the district—rather than the community—decided to put the dual language program at that school, which was "weird," "really hard," and "tense" because "it's not just school and it's not just jobs, there's a lot of teachers here who've lived in this neighborhood for generations and the entire Spanish-speaking population has not just changed their job it's changed their entire neighborhood. So it's very west-side story-ish in a lot of ways." One SEI teacher confirmed these societal concerns in stating: "I think many people are uneasy about bilingualism, multiculturalism. And you know, people from other countries are coming to steal our jobs [cries]." She asserts that "poor people have less opportunities and they're more vilified, like oh these poor people come to steal our jobs and then on the other hand to get benefits."

The other dual language teacher echoed the same societal concerns in stating:

> But yeah it's like fighting against the society in a way, and as individuals I guess it's hard and moving, and when I go to trainings sometimes when they hear where I'm coming from, the dual language, they're like how does that work, we don't believe in that, or they don't understand it, other educators. (DLL Teacher Interview, 2020)

Another SEI teacher described how the "office doesn't represent the culture of the school" because "the secretary doesn't know Spanish [and] would just hang up if the person didn't speak English," greatly frustrating Latinx families. These examples mark the proliferation of an English-speaking majority culture mindset, as well as perhaps lingering impacts from Question 2 that heralded in the nationalistic and xenophobic climate today.

4.3.4.4 Disability or language barrier

Research has shown that it can be challenging for teachers to understand the differences between diagnosing a language barrier versus a disability; oftentimes teachers conflate or confuse their identification (Adelson et al., 2014). To that end, all six teachers shared their perspectives of how they interpret this challenge, and their process for supporting children's needs. Most teachers (one DLL, two general education, one SEI) reported consulting with occupational and speech therapists in the schools to meet with a child in question and confirm that he or she may need additional support or if there is a language barrier. One general education teacher explained how she asked a bilingual speech therapist in the school to talk to a child one-on-one to determine if there was a language barrier or something more. Several teachers also cautioned that there could be underlying emotional issues, trouble adapting to school, or trauma, which is why they involve families and other specialists in determining the child's needs.

One dual language teacher stated that "it's when a kid's home language is not a super strong base that it gets really hard to tell, because we've had a few kids like that and we struggle," explaining the teacher's difficulty in identifying a language barrier versus needing additional academic support. The other general education teacher spoke about how "the denial of the families" can become an obstacle to supporting a child, because some families cannot

culturally accept that their child may have additional learning needs. She contended that every year one of the teachers will have a parent that's "not ready to hear that we need to give more to their children" and how challenging it is to navigate these sensitive conversations with families. This challenge can be situated within the context of the stigma associated with disabilities in Latinx communities, where families experience discrimination as a result of culture and disability, and the palpable consequences of being labeled (McHatton & Correa, 2005).

4.3.4.5 Communicating with families

Four of the six teachers (two DLL, one general education, one SEI) described being knowledgeable about their students' families and backgrounds. All four used various phone applications to communicate with the families, and one general education teacher not included in this list as she struggled to communicate with families did not use any apps, strongly suggesting that phone apps can be a critical communication tool with families of EBLs. Additionally, many of the teachers who successfully interacted with families had more students that walked to school.

Both dual language teachers explained that the school sends an internal questionnaire at the beginning of the year which asks "questions, culturally, like is there anything that you would like me to know about your family in terms of religion or food or culture," offering a stereotypical understanding of cultural inclusion. One dual language teacher explained that it was important to her to "show awareness and respect and inclusion, and I also want them to help me to reinforce those things at home." One general education teacher stated: "I let the parents know in the beginning of the year, if you want to share anything with your culture, please come and we'll do stuff together."

On the other hand, two teachers (one SEI, one general education) struggled to effectively communicate with families. The SEI teacher explained that while she did communicate with the families of the children who walked to school, as well as through an app, she still struggled to get to know the families. Many families would not show up for open houses, or she never saw them if the children took the bus. One general education teacher greatly struggled to communicate with families. She explained that "it's hard for our families who don't really speak English to connect with our schools," adding:

> A lot of families culturally do not want to engage with their schools for whatever reasons. And there's no written law that they have to return my phone calls or send things in from home. But sometimes making those connections from home to school can be very difficult. (General Education Teacher Interview, 2020)

The impositions of the teacher's cultural expectations—in these cases, returning a phone call, sending things to school, or attending an open house—are Eurocentric and serve to dehumanize EBLs' families. This teacher explained that she rarely saw the families of the children who rode the bus. She gave the following example:

> I mean some families I hardly ever see them [whispers]. I might meet them once or twice throughout the whole year. So if they come in and they're Spanish I find someone who is Spanish, you know I just run around, is so and so here, can you come translate? Or I'll go in in the morning, I need someone, who can speak Cape Verdean today? You know, it's all very harried. So you'll be standing by the phone going tell him to check the folder, and tell him he needs his blanket, and, you're trying to get everything in 'cause you might not speak to this woman for three more months. So I would say we're not doing a great job of communicating with our families who speak different languages. (General Education Teacher Interview, 2020)

This teacher learned about her students' families almost exclusively from the stories shared by her students, which limited the overall influence of their cultural and linguistic knowledge on her instructional practices. She also problematically assumed that "being Spanish" encompassed all speakers of the Spanish language, regardless of cultural identity or ethnicity, denigrating her students' unique languages and cultures into one blanket category. This attitude is antithetical to

Vygotsky and Rogoff's sociocultural theoretical approaches which honor and respect children's languages and cultures. While most teachers expressed being knowledgeable about their students' family's backgrounds and cultures, several teachers struggled to genuinely connect with families, which ultimately impacted the extent to which their instructional practices were culturally and linguistically inclusive of student backgrounds.

4.3.5 Do they report using ELDS differently for EBLs and English-dominant children?

The fifth part of this question looked at whether and how teachers reported using ELDS differently for EBLs and English-dominant children. The majority of teachers reported that ELDS to some extent differentially impact their EBLs, explaining that ELDS often do not consider cultural and linguistic diversity. All teachers reported modifying instruction or differentiating learning activities in order to support their EBLs, most commonly through small group instruction. Half of the teachers (one from each program type) revealed assumptions or biases towards their EBLs, speaking reflectively and openly about the impacts of their biases.

4.3.5.1 Insensitivity of ELDS for EBLs

Five of the six teachers (two DLL, two general education, one SEI) reported that ELDS are insensitive to the diverse opportunities some children have. One dual language teacher explained:

> And thinking about if the standards give some disadvantage, the only thing that I just thought about was culturally, the thing about handling a book, you know that's one of the standards for us, a big one, they don't have to come to school knowing it but some kids don't have access to books. Or they don't have it in their culture to read every night. (DLL Teacher Interview, 2020)

Similarly, a general education teacher gave the example of making eye contact, which may fall into a communication or social-emotional development domain: "if there's a culture where you need to have eye contact, but then the kids in their culture show respect as you look down. So the

Asian culture, there's some of that here." These examples demonstrate how standards, because they standardize, may not be sensitive to differences in children's opportunities to learn and their family expectations.

The other dual language teacher referred to the inherent sociocultural bias of the standards themselves. She explained she could "tell that [certain] families are part of the dominant culture where these standards and this rubric actually came from," alluding to an inherent bias in the development of the standards that disadvantages those who are not part of the dominant culture, echoing Rogoff's (2003) finding that individuals who establish standards assume their own developmental trajectories to be the norm, to the exclusion of those held by minoritized individuals.

She continued to explain her belief that standards and school policies are slow to follow social developments, referring to ELDS as "a hierarchy that's not always okay." While the majority of teachers reported that ELDS are insensitive to the diverse opportunities some children have, they did not offer solutions as to how they think ELDS could be revised to include "the rainbow of development of the child."

4.3.5.2 Modifications and differentiated instruction for EBLs

All six teachers modified instruction or differentiated learning activities in order to support their EBLs. The teachers did this in a variety of ways, including using a lot of visuals, following routines, previewing books, repeating different strategies every day of the week to suit different learners, one-on-one time, pairing off students with different language ability levels, and small group instruction where the teacher differentiated by behavior, skills, and likes. Small group instruction was by far the most common strategy for differentiating (all but one SEI teacher), as teachers maintained that it was easier for them to manage the students, assess

students, and in heterogeneous groups it allowed students the opportunity to learn from one another.

According to one dual language teacher, the differentiation might be as subtle as providing a child with a slant board to write better, or tracing letters on a sand tray because a child needs to be doing something completely different. Similarly, a general education teacher offered the example of students using play dough to work on the first letter of their name, while other kids will be stamping out their whole name and that of their friends, while saying all the letters. An SEI teacher gave the example of students playing a dice game, stating:

> So if the kids know very few numbers we can play with one dice. But if the kids know more numbers we can play with two dice, right? That would bring the numbers up to possibly up to twelve. And if they are very very good at numbers all the way up to twenty then we can play with three. So you can always modify. (SEI Teacher Interview, 2020)

One SEI teacher said: "You know some kids are ready to learn, are capable of learning three sounds at the same time, while others you might have to limit to two or one. So you do that in small groups." A dual language teacher explained that for children who are not interested in writing, she takes an interest of theirs, such as building a palace, and will write and label together with them what the rooms are for, therefore making learning out of what is already motivating them. All teachers confirmed that regardless of the child's level, they could always modify the activity depending on the child's needs.

One dual language teacher shared how differentiating for EBLs who are still very young and within an age range for developing early literacy and early math skills can be challenging. She called this "tricky" and questioned:

> Do I intervene yet and stress people out, or, but again, just sitting down with individuals is usually the best way to handle anything. Like oh I noticed you're having trouble with this, let's get two other friends who are also and we'll just take care of it while everyone else is practicing counting to five, because that's fine for them. (DLL Teacher Interview, 2020)

Overall, the teachers were all well versed in a variety of ways to individualize attention for their students.

4.3.5.3 Assumptions or biases about EBLs

Half of the teachers (one general education, one DLL, one SEI) revealed assumptions or latent biases about their EBL students. Speaking openly and transcending program types, the teachers acknowledged their biases about EBLs and the related impacts. These hidden biases and assumptions about EBL students and EBL student achievement were present across classroom types, even in classroom models catered towards EBLs. One dual language teacher explained that:

> Having the assumption that because their families are from there, that's what they know, is not a good start. Because yes, their grandparents may be from there, but then their parents grew here, and they know only what is here, so me making references to things from Puerto Rico for example might not make sense for those kids. (DLL Teacher Interview, 2020)

This dual language teacher also described a time where she misjudged a mother's disengagement from the school, not recognizing that she was a single mother and was working multiple jobs: "But yeah that was a learning lesson for me, and I was trying not to be judgmental of the family because you really don't know until you know. And you just see the kid and, yes I was thinking about the kid but there was more." This teacher expressed the importance of getting to know her students at the beginning of the year and not making assumptions about their backgrounds based on where their families come from.

Similarly, an SEI teacher cautioned jumping to conclusions about where children are from: "Just by looking at their skin color, I mean you might think oh they're from Dominican Republic but no they might be from Puerto Rico, they might be from Guatemala or Honduras you know." She also stated: "So it's funny because sometimes I think a child doesn't know any

English but then when, they surprise me sometimes, you know like when I do sit down and test them and so forth and they'll respond in English." In these examples, the teacher reflected on how she mistakenly assumed she knew her students' backgrounds and what knowledge and skillsets they brought with them to school, undergirding stereotypical notions of immigrant children, their families, and communities.

A general education teacher described being busy and overwhelmed at work, and reflected on how her biases also clouded her understanding of a child's capabilities. She explained:

> You've got a kid who doesn't really speak, they speak Spanish, they don't want to do anything unless you sit right next to them and you're working with them incessantly. So the bias thing that I wanted to say, I had a kid arrive late in the semester, I see he doesn't know how to hold a pencil. His name has four letters, he can't even really trace it, okay? So I was like oooh nooo [whispers], 'cause I have everyone signing in, you're in your groove, you're past that stage. So about a day later, I'm saying to myself, this kid's so low, oh my God I'm going to have to work so hard with him [whispers], a day later I test him on all his letters, and he knows all of them. And I was like oh, I wasn't expecting that. So after Christmas sometime he goes into the library, picks up *Make Way for Ducklings*, and reads it out loud. That was a case where he came in, he couldn't write, I assumed oh this kid knows nothing [whispers], 'cause I'm just like, everyone knows how to sign in now! You can't do J, oh my God! Yet he can do that, and he really struggled, it took the whole of the rest of the year to get him to write those four letters. He did do it, it wasn't great, but he worked hard every day. But the kid had tons of skills and strengths. So you do make assumptions about kids the first time you meet them just like you do when you meet adults. But it's just, are you going to hold fast to those or are you going to be surprised and just tell yourself wow, maybe you should have given this kid a chance before you just thought, you're going to have to work endlessly with him. And teachers do that all the time. (General Education Teacher Interview, 2020)

In this example, the teacher assumed that a newly arrived EBL did not have skills or strengths, and was later surprised at the skills he in fact brought with him. Moreover, this teacher had been teaching for nearly two decades and this scenario occurred one year ago, signaling how assumptions about student achievement can have lasting impact on teaching practices.

This general education teacher also assumed that nurturing one's native language in an academic setting may have detrimental effects on a child's future academic prospects, despite research (Mendez et al., 2015) showing otherwise. She explained her position:

> However I will say it could be problematic when you want to go to college, because then if you're looking ahead. Okay let's say you did have that, let's say some children gained less English skills, what's that going to mean when you apply to college. Or even if you wanted to go to a really good high school, like what if you want to go to BLS or BLA [Boston Latin School or Boston Latin Academy], are they going to do dual language? I mean, it's fine I guess at elementary to be like 'yeah, that can be great, kids can be learning Spanish' [singsong mocking voice] but if you look at the greater, what would that mean for their future… I mean maybe this is really biased of me but we live in a world where predominantly—even though more people might one day speak Spanish—we still, our world is set up in English. So would we be doing children a disservice by doing that? I think a lot of families want their children learning English and don't even want them to learn Spanish actually. Yeah because you have to be thinking of the things you're doing now, how's it going to impact this person in twenty years' time? This is their education, you can't keep switching things up all the time, because you have to train people, you have to get the funding, and changing people's mindsets is not easy, you know, and teachers don't like being told what to do [laughs]. (General Education Teacher Interview, 2020)

In this example, the teacher feared that a) dual language programs may leave students with "less English skills" in the first place and that b) this would impact their high school and college prospects. This teacher problematically assumed that harnessing a child's native language would be detrimental to their academic development, despite research indicating that this is a myth. She mocked the Spanish language and used words such as "problematic," and "disservice" to describe how she perceived the implications of Spanish language acquisition on a child's development, underscoring a deficit mindset towards EBLs. She also spoke to the challenge of changing people's mindsets and being told what to do, a trope throughout the interviews as teachers revealed the importance of having autonomy in their classrooms and doing what works for them, despite laws or mandates dictating otherwise (see section 2.1 for more on teacher autonomy).

4.4 Summary of Findings Related to RQ 2 and RQ 3

This study set out to explore the interplay between policy, standards, and EBLs in three different program models in Boston's public preschool programs. The study provides a close look at the nuanced perspectives of working with ELDS for EBLs, which has not been available until now. An analysis of the similarities and differences among program types follows in 4.1 and 4.2. Findings revealed that across program types, teachers responded to the toxic political climate for EBLs and the aftershocks of Question 2, which, together, undermined EBLs' knowledge and skillsets and fostered school environments in which students and teachers alike had to fight daily uphill battles to support EBLs, generally, and to defend bilingual teaching practices, specifically.

By and large, teachers halfheartedly feigned abidance of school policy and Question 2 legislation, while behind closed doors they worked fervently to support their EBLs in the ways they thought they knew best. However, despite teachers' best efforts, the undermining of EBLs' language and identity is so deeply entrenched in the sociopolitical fabric of schools and society that it has contributed to the hierarchy of language learners, negatively impacted how families perceive native language maintenance, and contributed to a pervasive fear and paranoia among immigrant families. Indeed, most teachers described their schools as environments that cultivated negative attitudes towards EBLs and/or bilingualism, which led to feelings of isolation from, and opposition to, mainstream societal mores. Interestingly, half of the teachers (one from each program type) revealed assumptions or biases towards their own EBLs, and also spoke reflectively and openly about the impacts of these biases.

One of this study's critical findings was that teachers who are bilingual reported having unique insight into how children acquire language, and into the use of cultural and linguistic

practices in the classroom. While being an English language learner was not a criterion for being chosen as an interviewee for this study, the majority of teachers interviewed were bilingual. I argue that this correlates with my finding that the majority of those interviewed conveyed that it was important for teachers to be able to communicate with children and families in their native languages in order to effectively teach them. Most teachers expressed being knowledgeable about their students' families and backgrounds, and those who communicated most successfully with families used mobile phone apps. Yet, despite the pedagogical advantages that bilingual teachers may have when teaching EBLs, all teachers reported that it was challenging to diagnose a language barrier versus a disability (and most consulted with school specialists to determine whether a child needed additional help).

The majority of teachers reported that ELDS to some extent differentially impacted their EBLs, explaining that ELDS often did not consider cultural and linguistic diversity. All teachers reported modifying instruction or differentiating learning activities in order to support their EBLs, most commonly through small group instruction. Half of the teachers explained the importance of informal assessments in evaluating EBLs' progress. The majority of teachers also discussed the important role that paraprofessionals played in successfully teaching their EBLs and in supporting the teacher throughout daily activities, suggesting a need for more attention from the district on professional development and general recognition for this critical role.

Additionally, this study explored how teachers reported feeling about ELDS, how they reported their preparation to use standards, and how teachers reported actually using them in the classroom, with particular attention to their EBL students. Most teachers reported that they do not look at ELDS on a regular basis but expressed feeling comfortable with the ELDS content. Overall, teachers described being knowledgeable about ELDS and believed that they were

important teaching tools, however at the same time, they expressed concern over the academic pushdown of expectations on K1, which felt burdensome and developmentally inappropriate, and created stressful learning environments for children. Half of the teachers expressed frustration in the number of assessments they had to administer to their EBLs, which they explained took away from getting to know the children and actually teaching.

Pre-service and in-service education on both using ELDS and on working with EBLs ranged from infrequent to exhaustive, with one teacher explaining that she was "bombarded" with professional development and another reporting that she had one professional development opportunity on ELDS more than five years ago and that it was not mandatory. Half of the teachers reported receiving prior education on working with EBLs, and only one teacher reported receiving in-service professional development on working with EBLs. Only two teachers reported receiving prior education on working with ELDS, while nearly all teachers reported receiving in-service professional development—ranging from infrequent to intensive—on working with ELDS. Additionally, most teachers described a need for more support with applying ELDS to EBLs and with ELDS implementation, as well as a desire for a "professional learning community" to share helpful strategies.

4.4.1 Summary analysis of similarities across program types

While K1 teachers across program types (SEI, general education, DLL) shared many similarities in their responses and very few differences, one surprising commonality emerged across coded themes: one teacher from each program type revealed personal assumptions or biases towards EBLs, and spoke reflectively and openly about the impacts of these biases. This finding demonstrates that internal biases towards EBLs and bilingualism are present across all programs—even those where teachers are working with higher numbers of EBLs. The teachers'

rhetoric also could reflect the current political climate in which xenophobia has, to a great extent, been normalized. These assumptions and biases can have implications for how teachers work with their EBL students and what types of expectations they hold for them (i.e. lower standards). This finding suggests a need for increased pre-service and in-service diversity and anti-bias education for all teachers, as this preparation may help teachers to confront personal biases and prevent prejudiced teaching practices. Moreover, two of the three teachers had each been teaching for two decades, signaling both that assumptions about student achievement can have lasting impacts on teaching practices, and also that it can be challenging to change teachers' mindsets.

Regarding ELDS, teachers responded similarly in their reports that standards were important tools that teachers understood, but that standards were infrequently referenced, negatively impacted students, and differentially impacted EBLs. They also expressed that there was a conflict between ELDS and developmentally appropriate expectations. Teachers expressed being burdened by the increased academic pushdown of expectations in K1, which were thought to be developmentally inappropriate and stress inducing for students. Relatedly, all conveyed that there were too many assessments for EBLs, which consequentially decreased critical learning time for students. It is significant that teachers did not bring up the importance of developing social and emotional skills, or how standardized assessments frequently dismiss social and emotional skills (Heckman, 2015). Similarities in the ELDS themes that surfaced among teachers suggest a need for a closer look at how ELDS are implemented with EBLs in mind, and greater teacher involvement in the writing and revising of ELDS. Moreover, the number and nature of assessments given to EBLs should be revisited, with a closer look at what data are produced and

how those data are used; perhaps there is a way to consolidate data collection for multiple assessments.

Other similarities across program types included teacher autonomy, suggesting that regardless of classroom model, and despite school policies or statewide legislation such as Question 2 that dictate following particular strategies, teachers will do what they personally think is best for students. Teachers across program types also expressed frustration with Boston's school selection process whereby a seat in a particular classroom is designated to a child regardless of his or her actual attendance, suggesting that these attendance patterns are applicable to all program models and need a closer look. Teachers expressed similar concerns over Question 2 and the negative impacts of this legislation on EBLs, and teachers were optimistic but cautious over the potential impact of the Look Act on EBLs. Few teachers were actually familiar with the LOOK Act, however, suggesting a need for more informed policy dissemination in schools. Teachers across program types shared their perspectives on how professional development could be most beneficial, including breaking down ELDS by language needs for EBLs, providing more support with implementation, and cultivating a "professional learning community" to share helpful strategies.

Other significant similarities across program types included teachers' references to the indispensable role of the paraprofessional in the classroom, as the "paras" by and large supported teachers in successfully teaching their EBL students. Teachers relied heavily on their paras in their daily teaching, signifying a need for comparable appreciation, professional development, and pay parity for paras given the important role they play. The majority of teacher participants were bilingual, and across program types they referenced how their own immigrant background influenced their teaching of EBLs and their understanding of children's language development.

Teachers across program types explained that diagnosing a language barrier versus a disability posed challenges, and they sought support from speech therapists and other experts at the school. In general, teachers also described being knowledgeable about EBLs' families and backgrounds, and those that communicated most successfully with families used mobile phone apps. Finally, all teachers across program types modified learning for EBLs, most commonly through small group instruction.

Overall, across program types, teachers reacted to a negative political climate for EBLs involving a longstanding institutional legacy that has been exacerbated by the Trump administration, which, coupled with the aftershocks of Question 2, undermined EBLs' knowledge and skillsets and cultivated a xenophobic and fearful environment for students and teachers alike. Amidst this environment, teachers across all program types explained how they worked hard to support EBLs despite this atmosphere, yet the intolerant sociopolitical climate is so entrenched in schools and society that it influences how families perceive of native language maintenance, how teachers view EBL student achievement, and contributes to a general pervasiveness of intolerance, fear, and paranoia towards, and also among, immigrant families.

4.4.2 Summary analysis of differences across program types

Across the three program types—SEI, general education, and DLL K1 programs—there were more similarities in teacher responses than differences. The most significant differences across program types were reflected in teachers' reported pre-service and in-service education experiences. Only half of the teachers (two SEI and one general education) reported receiving prior education on working with EBLs, while neither dual language teacher reported receiving this type of prior education on working with EBLs. Only one general education teacher reported receiving in-service professional development on working with EBLs. Similarly, only two

teachers reported receiving prior education on working with ELDS, while neither SEI teacher reported receiving this type of prior preparation on working with ELDS. On the other hand, teachers across all program types reported receiving in-service professional development (while it varied in scope and frequency) on working with ELDS. These findings suggest a great need for increased pre-service and in-service education on working with EBLs, as well as increased pre-service education on understanding and implementing ELDS.

Since teachers in SEI programs in particular lacked pre-service education on ELDS, SEI endorsement courses should be reviewed to ensure that understanding and implementing ELDS for EBLs are an essential component of the curriculum. The SEI teacher endorsement should not be an obligatory standalone course that pre-service teachers check off their list to meet licensing requirements, but rather these courses should support teachers' skills and knowledge necessary to teach academic content in English to EBLs, emphasizing linguistically and culturally appropriate ELDS implementation. Additionally, dual language teachers reported lacking pre-service education on working with EBLs, an interesting finding given the minoritized population of students with whom dual language teachers work. Consequently, pre-service teacher education programs whose graduates go on to work with EBLs must ensure that a thorough knowledge of EBLs' development and learning needs is part and parcel of the curriculum.

Other differences were reflected in the extent to which teachers referenced a language hierarchy in which monolingual English speakers are praised for their second language learning and English language learners are expected to learn English as a baseline for academic achievement (Cervantes-Soon, 2014; Valdés, 1997). General education teachers did not speak to this topic, suggesting perhaps a need for increased general education teacher preparation on working with minoritized student populations. Similarly, only dual language and SEI teachers—

no general education teachers—referenced both the importance of being able to communicate with children and families in their native languages, as well as the external negative language or attitudes towards EBLs that they witnessed in their school environments or society. Only one general education and one SEI teacher struggled to effectively communicate with families, while dual language teachers—perhaps unsurprisingly due to the teachers' ability to speak in the child's native language—had the most success in communicating with families, suggesting that DLL programs are best equipped to engage with the families of young EBLs. The teachers who struggled to connect with families relied on the students to learn about their languages and cultures, which ultimately had a negative impact on the extent to which their instructional practices were sufficiently inclusive, both culturally and linguistically, of student backgrounds. This finding suggests that general education and SEI programs—where the teachers do not necessarily speak the languages of their EBL students, thereby limiting communication with families—are at a disadvantage in implementing culturally and linguistically sustaining instructional practices.

Further, only two teachers (one DLL and one general education) commented on flaws of the initial enrollment form that determines a child's school placement and language services provided, suggesting that SEI programs may have more successful placements according to children's language needs than general education or DLL programs. Due to misidentification, students may be under-identified as an English speaker and miss out on essential services. In fact, this under-identification was part of the United States Department of Justice and Education's 2010 lawsuit that found that Boston had under-counted EBLs throughout the district, therefore depriving those students of language and support services, as required by the Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974 and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The lawsuit

further found that teachers were inadequately prepared to teach English language learners, particularly in SEI classrooms. It is therefore critical for BPS to take a closer look at how students are placed and to work with families to provide EBLs with developmentally appropriate services.

4.5 Findings Related to Research Question 4: How do state and district level education policy experts perceive the relationships between Massachusetts language policy, ELDS, and the needs of young EBL students?

The fourth research question aimed to uncover how state and district level education policy experts made sense of the intersection between policy, standards, and EBLs. A breakdown of policy expert responses by BPS, EEC, and DESE is not included as it has the potential to reveal individual's identities and would threaten confidentiality. Several themes surfaced among participants as a response to this research question (described below in more detail), including: cultural and linguistic diversity in ELDS; ELDS and the accountability system; pressure of ELDS on teachers; ELDS and EBLs; ELDS and vertical transitions; feedback on use of ELDS; influence of teacher background on using ELDS; integration of ELDS; lack of preparation for ELDS; need for director support; lack of agency role clarity; comments on Question 2; and comments on the LOOK Act.

The overarching themes that emerged across responses revealed that, by and large, policy experts lamented the academic pushdown of more rigorous standards in early childhood, a byproduct of the accountability system and its influence on PreK. Policy experts conveyed that standards were not linguistically nor culturally sustaining (Paris, 2012), and they explained that there were too many separate standards documents, which conflicted with both their expectation that programs use all the standards, and their belief that ELDS put extra pressure on teachers.

Policy experts lacked feedback on how PreK teachers implement ELDS, and they were unsure how many educators use WIDA. There was consensus that there is a need for program director or principal support in understanding and implementing ELDS, as well as preparation for PreK teachers on using ELDS. Finally, while policy experts touted the importance of ELDS as central to a high-quality early childhood classroom and to successful vertical transitions for children, there was a surprising discrepancy between the agency offices in the discernment of responsibilities regarding standards development and education.

4.5.1 Cultural and linguistic diversity in ELDS

Five of the six policy experts shared their perspectives of the extent to which ELDS consider cultural and linguistic diversity. Four of the five participants conveyed that the standards were neither linguistically nor culturally sustaining (Paris, 2012). One participant reconfirmed participant anonymity before responding that "this is a huge area of work" and that the office is beginning to have challenging conversations around implicit bias and dismantling racism, but that they are not there yet in talking about "the extent to which [they] think about culture and language and diversity in our learning standards specifically." Further, this participant questioned the extent to which "instructional practices are largely driven by white middle class values" and how this lens can be altered to better reflect the children and families served. This participant feared that some principals and educators are ready to have these conversations and others are not, and a consequence of this overall value system is that children of minoritized backgrounds are retained, suspended, or expelled because "their behaviors, their way of engaging with the learning process doesn't fit with what society has defined as education." This policy expert's responses ultimately pointed to a broader policy context and

how standards should be discussed in-depth as part of a larger systemic approach to educational equity.

Another participant asserted that what they would change about the learning standards is "making sure they're much more reflective of the children and families that we serve and that kids see their cultures, see their families reflected in our learning standards." Another participant explained that "no matter what you do, standards aren't as responsive as they need to be, because in order to be responsive, you have to do it locally… so I don't think the standard is really going to be able to specify exactly what you need to do." An additional participant stated: "so I'll be honest, I disagree with some of the standards because I don't think that they're culturally and linguistically sound." This policy expert explained that despite a teacher's pedagogical practices based on their interpretation of a standard—and any accommodations they make to support minoritized students in reaching that standard—the double-edged sword evoked is that students are still evaluated according to a particular benchmark norm, therefore disadvantaging them. This policy expert cautioned:

> So by being more culturally and linguistically aware as a district, I don't know if that's a good thing or a bad thing when it comes time to take that test, especially if the argument at the end of the day, with that particular argument, was too bad, it's in the standards. (Policy Expert Interview, 2020)

Underlying this policy expert's statement is a deficit approach to EBLs' learning, since the participant did not believe that cultural and linguistic inclusivity would be a worthwhile investment when it would not impact test scores, and when ELDS are reflective of dominant Eurocentric benchmarks. Her comments are reflective of a desire to maintain the status quo, and can be linked to Rogoff's (2003) understanding that individuals who establish standards assume their own developmental trajectories to be the norm, to the exclusion of those held by non-dominant, ethnically and linguistically minoritized individuals.

4.5.2 ELDS and the accountability system

Three participants referenced ELDS in the context of the larger educational accountability system which often dominates standards, instruction, and assessment, and where investments in PreK often come with accountability expectations. One participant explained that standards do not optimize learning through play and exploration, but rather they have become similar to rigorous standards in higher grades, resulting in a "hyper focus on standards" that ends up "siloing us [by content area] and maybe not allowing us to really think creatively about how our students actually attain standards." This participant cautioned that standards are often perceived as a linear path when in reality they are multifaceted and complex. Another participant shared the concern that "we're bleeding in, that this pushdown effect of the accountability system from grade three on down is eventually, if it hasn't already, going to hit preschool," echoing Rogoff's (2007) metaphor of a racetrack to describe the rush to teach young children academic concepts as based on the cultural community of the majority. This participant worried that teachers may not have "permission" to implement developmentally appropriate practices in the context of early learning standards, a concern echoed by other policy experts who explained that standards could disadvantage students despite teachers' developmentally appropriate instructional practices given that the standards ultimately inform student assessments.

One participant gave an example of visiting a principal's "prize [kindergarten] classroom" (relevant, while not PreK) where the principal boasted how quietly the students were sitting at their desks doing worksheets. Teachers use worksheets because they believe they are demonstrating learning progress, when in fact worksheets often push developmentally inappropriate standards on young children (Grossman, 2008; Strauss, 2020). The policy expert explained how "all that training that a teacher may have gotten about what we call productive

chaos in a classroom should and can look like falls away because it's not anything that's been reinforced;" rather the teacher is being evaluated based on what the principal values seeing in instructional practice.

Another participant echoed this notion of standards playing an important role in convincing those higher-up to get things done given that accountability is intrinsically tied to standards. This policy expert stated:

> And my fear is, is that if I went into some preschool classrooms I'm fairly certain that I would find some of that going on there too. Again I think that it's a symptom in some ways of the accountability system that was well intended to try and level the playing field, but I think in our desire to increase outcomes we've gotten to a place where we think louder more intensely is better right? So sort of this drill and kill approach is going to get us to close those gaps, and in fact what it's doing in my mind is widening the gaps and leading to a level of disengagement that concerns me. You walk into classrooms at nine o'clock in the morning and kids are already disengaged then we have a problem. (Policy Expert Interview, 2020)

These policy experts shared the same concern of wanting to make sure that standards are being met, while finding this goal sometimes at odds with capitalizing on what is developmentally appropriate instruction and pedagogy for young children.

Additionally, four of six policy experts linked accountability of ELDS with grant funding. Several experts signaled that education around standards was very limited due to inconsistent funding and resources. One participant said, "it's usually a one-time thing just 'cause of resources," and another said that with "grant funding gone, we've lost the organization to kind of help us keep the trainings going." In Boston's UPK it is "part of our accountability like, if we're going to give you money, we expect that you're doing this curriculum." Another policy expert explained how Massachusetts ELDS became embedded in college coursework and programs through a funding opportunity; "it was, you want this funding, you need to follow these, incorporate these standards into your program." One expert spelled this relationship out

very clearly, saying that depending on participation in particular funding opportunities, there is an expectation to show that standards are used and resourced as a tool, possibly through a core requirement to demonstrate that. This expert stated: "in the development of training and offering of things, it comes down to the funds available and the need for the training and the interest of the training. We don't want to develop something no one's going to attend." These policy experts underscore how accountability related to ELDS implementation (delivered through professional development or coursework) is tied to local, state, or federal funds.

4.5.3 Pressure of ELDS on teachers

Four of the six policy experts believed that standards put extra pressure on teachers in their busy and demanding workdays. One expert explained the challenge in helping teachers to embed standards in the work that they are already doing, stating that "you continue to hear that we can't do this because that's adding onto our day or the time that we have and we're always like but it's not, it's how you then take all this stuff and think about what you're doing." This expert explained that teachers "just see it as separate and they see it as more work, which is unfortunate." According to this expert, the newer math and ELA standards were a big challenge for teachers to adapt to and they were very upset about the changes. Another policy expert similarly commented on receiving feedback from teachers who said, "I don't want to do this," to which the expert said their response was, "I understand it's going to be difficult, but it's important for children so we're still going to do it." This expert explained that the sheer number of standards documents could make it difficult for a preschool teacher to balance with everything else they need to do.

Another policy expert echoed the sentiment that "teachers feel the pressure of the standards and the accountability system." This expert referred to teachers' understanding of

ELDS and the double-edged sword of trying to implement developmentally appropriate practice, modifying instruction for linguistically and culturally minoritized learners, and ultimately being both evaluated as teachers and assessing students based on a more rigid set of standards that do not align with those practices, echoing the double-edged sword sentiment from section 5.1. Another policy expert similarly expressed that teachers have become "hyper focused" on getting their students from a to b, rather than taking a holistic approach to making sure that students are meeting standards.

4.5.4 ELDS and EBLs

All six policy experts commented on the relationships between ELDS and EBLs, focusing largely on the use or lack of use of the WIDA standards. One policy expert believed that standards should emphasize developing a strong primary language first so that the introduction of English is consistent with the research on "second language acquisition." This policy expert worried that EBLs are moved to English as quickly as possible, "following the [Massachusetts curriculum] frameworks," resulting in a greater challenge in developing English. Moreover, this expert acknowledged the value of standards, and contended that a strong understanding of the WIDA standards is important to embed these practices into all content and instructional practices, as opposed to viewing the WIDA as implementing one practice at one point in the curriculum.

Another policy expert explained their realization that WIDA was an amazing resource for educators and how "it totally shifts I think your mindset as an educator and how that child is learning and processing." While participants voiced the value of the standards in principle, they illuminated the challenges associated with their use. For example, one policy expert was unsure how many educators were "actually using that information to do what it was intended to do," and

further explained that the WIDA education sessions were not being rolled out as much as they were in previous years. Relatedly, another policy expert believed that the WIDA standards were a much higher level than the other standards, yet were not guiding their work. Another policy expert described feeling that teachers were thinking about the WIDA standards very separately than the other standards, and questioned how much teachers relied on them as they were actually teaching.

One policy expert believed that "the early childhood practices are designed [to be] much more responsive to dual language learners," contradicting another expert's perspective that something is missing in the standards if EBLs lag behind their peers in first grade. This participant wondered whether WIDA could offer more support than other ELDS that would help EBLs so that fewer students regress or are identified in first grade. This policy expert believed that insufficient time has been spent between the BPS early childhood and English language learner offices determining how accessible and appropriate the BPS Focus Curriculum is for EBLs. Indeed, this expert further stated that teachers have complained about how to ensure that the curriculum is accessible to EBLs and aligned with WIDA standards, adding, "I don't think that that's an area where we've done great work." This policy expert explained: "I think we need to be looking at those early standards and looking at how are we actually making sure that everything that we are providing to our teachers has kept in mind the early education WIDA standards."

4.5.5 ELDS and vertical transitions

Five of the six policy experts shared their perspectives of utilizing ELDS in the context of vertical transitions between PreK and kindergarten. All participants believed that ELDS strengthened children's transitions, and emphasized the importance of kindergarten teachers

knowing what PreK teachers are teaching so they are aware of what children need when they transition. More than the ELDS, one expert believed in the importance of continuity in instructional practices from PreK to second grade, yet stated that "in PreK programs you don't have a well-trained workforce nor a culture of expectations of standards at all," suggesting that lower early childhood education standards for students and educators could hinder the continuity of instructional practices across grade levels.

Another policy expert explained that the transition in learning environments and expectations between PreK and kindergarten is not necessarily positive given the lack of continuity of developmentally appropriate practices between the two grades. This policy expert explained that there is a trickledown effect with very different expectations for what incoming kindergarten students should know and be able to do versus preschool students, stating that the expectations are not aligned. This participant believed that "kids are being asked to do things that developmentally are not appropriate" and that if you were to peel apart the expectations of incoming kindergarteners, they would far surpass the preschool expectations. Verifying confidentiality, this expert stated a fear that a lack of developmentally appropriate expectations for children is leading to student disengagement, challenges in student self-perception, and an increase in retention. Another expert believed that theoretically using all the standards would build upon one another and lead to students being very prepared for kindergarten and first grade, but explained that in reality there are different levels of preparedness among children and a first grade regression. This expert questioned:

> Is the reason that our students, the regression that we see in first grade, for example is that because we're not using all the standards and we're not appropriately preparing them for first grade? Is it because it's just a language issue that hasn't been caught or it hasn't been accounted for or is it because we're not using the WIDA standards earlier, you know, I actually don't know. (Policy Expert Interview, 2020)

4.5.6 Feedback on use of ELDS

Five of six policy experts commented on the feedback they received from educators and principals on ELDS. When asked about how early childhood programs are using ELDS, one participant replied: "I think that right now it's more, people are using them, yeah I don't think anyone's probably on top of that [laughs]," adding that "I don't know how [ELDS are] being enforced at this point. I think some programs are using it, and still using the green book right now, which is the preschool guidelines, but I think there still needs to be a lot of work around that in both realms." This expert also explained that it was "just a given" that preschools are using the standards, but later said that these interview questions were very important and "we've done this so many times where we've gone out and done these big trainings and just like you say, so then what? You know? And I think that those are really good questions you're asking for us." This policy expert wanted to take these interview questions into a meeting with colleagues to go over how the standards are being rolled out and supported, a strong signal that there is a need to better understand how standards are implemented in practice.

Another expert said that there are evaluations for principals and educators that solicit feedback, but the evaluations are not necessarily specific to standards. Another expert echoed this sentiment in saying that professional development opportunities have evaluations, but they do not particularly get into the standards. This expert explained that monitoring the extent to which programs use standards is not in a licensing checklist, so programs *could* receive feedback on standards use but only if they receive a coaching grant or receive technical assistance, and even then "we didn't necessarily document that" and "we don't have record of it necessarily."

In Boston, one expert explained that there is a fidelity tool that is used to look at quality and adherence to the curriculum, which includes standards but cannot capture all that an educator

does in few observations. The BPS K1 curriculum was designed in-house and therefore teachers were able to provide feedback from piloting it. One policy expert explained that in the process of developing a BPS Haitian Creole dual language program, they received a lot of feedback from families and community members about how the curriculum and instruction was aligned to standards. This expert explained that "sort of by default that happened in that situation and continues to happen in that situation, but it's not something that we have organized for in other ways," suggesting that a streamlined mechanism for ongoing parent and teacher feedback on standards and instruction could be very valuable to BPS.

4.5.7 Influence of teacher background on using ELDS

Three policy experts spoke to the perceived influences of teachers' backgrounds on their utilization of standards. One policy expert explained the belief that if a teacher is not sure how to implement instructional practices, he or she will not then know how to help children reach a standard. This expert conveyed that the updated preschool science standards revealed a lack of teachers' content knowledge and the ability to effectively think about instruction for young children. Additionally, this expert stated that this is the "tricky part with standards" because "if you don't have the education or you can't think in that way, and you don't have a director or a leader who can help you, you struggle right," alluding to how a teacher's educational background influences their knowledge and utilization of ELDS.

Another expert dismissed the role of standards entirely, saying "I think that a really strong teacher who is making connections, differentiating, using strong vocabulary explicitly, helping children learn to read explicitly—so I do think there is the science of reading—could do all that without standards," suggesting that intentional instruction is more important than understanding standards. This expert further explained that you may have standards, but if

teachers do not have high expectations of children, then they cannot teach successfully. At the same time, another policy expert contended that standards could "open up a whole new world" once educators are able to understand the standards and see examples of how they can be implemented.

4.5.8 Integration of ELDS

Another theme that surfaced among four policy experts was the lack of integration of standards documents. There was a general sentiment among policy experts that there were too many standards documents, complicating instruction for teachers. Complicating matters, there is a prevailing expectation that programs are able to integrate the standards into the curriculum. These policy experts feared that the field sees the standards as varied and quite distinct, and as having limited logic and continuity. One expert was hopeful that the new GPKLE standards would integrate all the different sets of standards into one place so that educators could "see the progression of learning and also the integration of all of these standards."

Another participant explained that they would like to weave the standards together so that the field does not continue to see them as separate. According to this participant, policy experts say that the documents are designed to be used together, yet she could not think of an example of any communication tools, professional development, or presentations on ELDS that have not delivered the content of ELDS in isolation, presenting on just one of the documents. This expert stated: "I can't personally think of a time where we've come together and said hey, look how nicely these all fit together. And as a system we really should be thinking about how to do that work better." Another expert thought that it would be helpful to show the integration of standards alignment for educators through education on standards crosswalks, but was not sure how widely shared the crosswalks were, nor how programs might be using those crosswalks to determine

alignment and connections. One participant conveyed that a "hyper focus on standards" ends up "siloing us" by content area and does not allow for creative thinking about how students attain standards, contradicting Vygotsky's sociocultural theory that emphasizes the influence of language and culture, as well as the relations between teachers and students, on development. Viewing the documents separately reinforces the pushdown effect of academically rigorous standards in early childhood, as well as a false narrative that children's development can be compartmentalized into various disciplines. A more holistic approach to children's learning through integrated ELDS would help educators understand the importance of development as situated within the greater sociohistorical context.

4.5.9 Lack of preparation for ELDS

Five of six policy experts disclosed their perceptions of a lack of preparation for ELDS among PreK educators, with several commenting on the lack of preparation for WIDA standards in particular. One expert explained that the WIDA professional development was not being rolled out as much anymore and that they were unsure how many educators were actually using that information to implement WIDA standards. This same participant explained that they had a lot of work to do to help people understand the new GPKLE standards, but was unsure what professional development opportunities were being planned, whispering that they have not really done any education sessions and have not heard what their plans are. Another participant explained that continuing education opportunities do not require preparation in the WIDA E-ELD standards, and if sessions are offered through a grant, they are typically short and discrete courses. This participant expressed that if educators had a "professional learning community" or instructional support around implementing the standards altogether, "and more ongoing and not just one point in time," this could help them with implementation. Participants believed that

educators need ongoing professional development on standards implementation to support their practice. One expert explained that "you can learn a standard and you can read the book and you can know a standard by heart but then it's the implementation piece, or seeing how that plays out in a classroom of twenty toddlers is very different than how it is in the book," signaling the importance of professional development on standards and instructional practice. Another policy expert conveyed that the curriculum can only do so much and it is the teaching strategies that allow a student to meet a benchmark standard. This participant questioned: "what part of this curriculum is helping that student meet that standard, and if they're not meeting that standard, what is a strategy or, that I'm adding into this curriculum or making sure that I'm doing to make sure that they are getting that?"

Another expert stated: "I'm sure they need a lot more professional development, we just don't have necessarily the capacity to do the standards and also, should you be trained in the standards?" This participant equated understanding standards and instructional practices to being a medical doctor, questioning whether doctors should be trained in the techniques or taught the expectations around surgery, signaling prioritizing education in strong instructional practices. According to this expert, BPS early childhood educators are "kind of on their own" in terms of understanding and implementing the curriculum because the standards are embedded within the curriculum, unless they are first-year teachers in which case they receive focused coaching. Another expert echoed these sentiments in saying that despite the importance of standards as the guideposts of all that should be covered, the district "does not do a great job of providing training" and the district has not integrated standards well into the actual curriculum and teaching practices. This expert stated:

> You know so I think we have all of these things, and then the teachers are left to figure them out and use them. We're like here's the standards, here's the, here's all the things

> you need to know that they need to know. And then here's the curriculum and things like that. But as far as like making the bridge between all of these things, I don't really think we do that [whispers], you know? I think they're handed the standards, sometimes, and sometimes not, they're handed a curriculum, and it's sort of up to them to figure out. (Policy Expert Interview, 2020)

This expert also explained that many competing priorities coupled with limited time in the day has resulted in less ongoing professional development on instructional practices.

4.5.10 Need for director support

Three policy experts spoke of the importance of having program director or principal support in understanding and implementing standards through professional development, suggesting that a lack of leadership in this area can hamper a teacher's ability to effectively utilize standards. One policy expert explained that understanding standards is hard work, and if you "don't have a director or a leader who can help you, you struggle right." Another expert echoed these sentiments in stating:

> It's just this idea that principals are key in whatever professional development we provide for educators because what we're learning is we can train them on good practices but if they're in a building where the principal has a different pedagogy then those practices will never come to fruition in any classroom, because when you're being evaluated you're going to do what your evaluator wants you to do. (Policy Expert Interview, 2020)

Here this policy expert emphasized the importance of principal education in both ELDS and early childhood instructional practices and pedagogy in order to best support their teachers. This expert gave the example of speaking with a school principal who said when he walks into an early childhood classroom and the children look happy, how does he know that they are really learning?

A third policy expert similarly explained that "if a director is not on board, they might not, the [standards] implementation won't happen." This expert gave examples of cases where educators have returned from a professional development opportunity and attempted to

implement something and "the director's like no, that's not how we do it," thwarting the success of the session. This participant believed that in addition to instructional practice, professional learning communities, and ongoing professional development, directors need increased preparation to understand implementation strategies more broadly.

4.5.11 Lack of agency role clarity

Four of six policy experts spoke of a confusion about roles between their respective offices and others that they work with, setting boundaries in terms of their work responsibilities. For example, one policy expert at EEC deferred to DESE in discussing work on standards revisions, saying that they would wait until the new document was finished to begin working on professional development. Likewise, this expert explained that the "tricky part" was that public preschool educators came to a particular set of EEC professional development sessions, but was unsure if DESE was also supporting their preschool educators around this work, strongly suggesting that public PreK was in DESE's purview. This expert raised the delicate question of the jurisdiction over public PreK and who is responsible between EEC and DESE for particular professional development. On the other hand, a policy expert from DESE shared:

> If you look at the enabling legislation for EEC, they have jurisdiction over public PreKs. They don't take responsibility in my mind enough for public PreK, I don't think they see them right now as part of the mixed delivery system so I think public PreKs are kind of stuck in a very gray area. [Public PreK] doesn't see EEC as an agency that they can go to so they often come here. We have special education funding that we administer here so public PreKs get support from DESE in that context of inclusive practices, but I think in terms of seeing themselves as part of the early childhood system in Massachusetts, I don't, I don't think that they do. (Policy Expert Interview, 2020)

This expert maintained that the jurisdiction over public PreK was confusing even for those working directly with state-level early childhood matters.

Further, this expert at DESE conveyed:

> It's a really difficult spot because we don't step into PreK because we don't want it to be perceived as we're stepping into EEC's space, and yet it's a difficult thing to do when we know that public schools don't really see themselves in that EEC space. (Policy Expert Interview, 2020)

This expert explained that the response to this discrepancy was collaborating on initiatives such as joint professional development in order to pull the birth to grade three space together, but "it's not always an easy dance." One expert defined what is perhaps the crux of this difference: "who does what and who's not doing what thinking somebody else is doing it and you're not." An additional policy expert dismissed the WIDA E-ELD standards as an EEC initiative and therefore could not speak to the development of these standards, again speaking to the distinctive work responsibilities within state and district education offices. In a similar vein, another policy expert confided that they believed there was a lack of curriculum and content people in particular BPS offices, creating a challenging environment for effectively working together across disciplines. This expert explained that the work is "compartmentalized" and that there lacks a "coherent approach" across offices, indicating an obstacle to effectively working together across departments and disciplines. Vygotsky helps to understand the importance of working together across disciplines—including the offices of language learners and early childhood—in order to frame children's learning and development within their greater sociohistorical context. By effectively working together across disciplines, ELDS may be collectively developed and reviewed by experts who understand that language and culture play a central role in children's development.

4.5.12 Perspectives of Question 2

For all six policy experts, the Question 2 legislation contradicted their understanding of how children learn language and actually disadvantaged EBLs. Two policy experts expressed

concern that EBL children were over-referred for special education because they were English language learners, when there was nothing wrong with their intellectual abilities. One policy expert conveyed that Question 2 had an impact on a child's ability to learn, did not recognize the value of having two languages, and did not demonstrate an understanding of how language develops despite the research on brain and language development. Another expert echoed these sentiments and explained that the English-only narrative was "damaging" to students because they felt that they could not speak their own language for fear of negative educational repercussions. This expert stated: "I think it definitely had a negative effect. I think just overall you're not validating students' language, you're not validating students' culture, definitely just by saying just the phrase alone 'we only speak English here' and 'don't speak another language when somebody from central offices comes in.'"

Another expert similarly conveyed the impact of Question 2 in the sudden shift to prioritizing teaching English "without recognizing that if we build a primary language well, then shifting to that English language development becomes easier and more efficient." This policy expert worried about allowing people to make decisions that impact others without having any background context or knowledge to make those decisions, stating "for me, that question was really about equity and implicit bias and how we allow the system that's largely driven by white middle class people, to come to make policy decisions." This expert explained that Question 2 perpetuated and opened the proficiency gap and stated that their data speaks volumes about [the achievement gap for EBLs]. Another policy expert also referenced data exposing how Massachusetts is one of the best performing states, but not for English learners "because we did not meet the needs of all of our students because of Question 2 and because we had to have SEI programs only. So that English-only, SEI program only approach did not help so much." This

expert expressed that the way the law was written was "deceiving," because the law was ultimately written differently than the proposition on the ballot, encouraging students to speak English. One policy expert referenced the Department of Justice (DOJ) finding that BPS was not appropriately serving English language learners. This expert was unsure if the DOJ finding was related to Question 2 and then not knowing how to serve students, or if it was "always happening and the DOJ just caught it."

Another expert conveyed that Question 2 was neither "culturally sustaining" nor "wise," as well as "cost money" and came from "a bigot." This expert described the impact of Question 2 in an increase in language testing of young EBL children, saying that it's "ridiculous" and a "huge enterprise, I have no idea what the impact is, and they have to stop, stop what they're doing to do it," citing the lost teaching time and heavy burden on teachers and students alike. Another policy expert vividly recalled the "trashing of materials" in other languages, remembering dumpsters full of bilingual textbooks. At the time, this policy expert was teaching at a transitional bilingual program, and recalled teachers losing their jobs as a result of Question 2, the shift to SEI, and the teachers' resistance to change. The participant stated:

> We're still going to teach the way we were teaching until somebody from central offices walks in and then we're going to go back to English. And that happened, and it was definitely one of those things where principals told teachers, teachers told each other, when somebody comes in your classroom, only speak in English. Because any teacher who taught before Question 2 definitely valued that native language. (Policy Expert Interview, 2020)

This expert further recalled seeing the shift from bilingual education to SEI and the disintegration of programs over time; teachers started to retire and new teachers came in that bought into the new English only theory or instructional model.

The policy experts unanimously referenced the benefits of learning in one's primary language before being immersed in English language development, and the flaws in a too-sudden

shift to teaching English. While participants mentioned research on children's brain and language development and the benefits of learning multiple languages, one participant feared that society is not in a place "where everybody believes, especially here, that it is a benefit to be bilingual." This policy expert explained that there has been a deficit mindset towards English language learners for a long time, and pointed towards a language hierarchy that values second language learning for monolingual English speakers as a bilingual double standard (see section 2.2 above on the language hierarchy); "so if you're bilingual and your first language was English, it's like you're golden, if you're bilingual and your first language was something other than English, it's like it takes on a completely different lens." This participant suggested that there could be a practical rationale behind this lens, saying that a monolingual (English-speaking) student learning a second language would not negatively impact a teacher's scores, while on the other hand, for an English language learner, "those things are going to impact." Another policy expert conveyed that Question 2 did not impact their office because it only affected public preschool, dismissing the role that the EEC office plays in public PreK. There was consensus among policy experts that Question 2 failed EBLs in Massachusetts, and there remains a pervasive deficit mindset towards EBLs in which society does not believe in the benefits of bilingualism. This mindset can hinder the expansion of programs that could support multilingualism and multiculturalism.

4.5.13 Perspectives of the LOOK Act

All six policy experts gave their impressions of the LOOK Act and how it might influence the teaching of EBLs in the state moving forward. Two policy experts dismissed the LOOK Act as not impacting EEC but rather impacting DESE and the public preschool world, saying that "it's more of a public school thing," speaking to a discrepancy in work expectations

between agencies highlighted earlier in section 5.11. One policy expert questioned "what happened to all those kids who were in between the passage of Question 2 and the LOOK Act who didn't have the option to know that bilingual opportunities were more effective around language development." Moreover, this policy expert lamented the fact that they would likely again be in a scenario where ballot questions will go up and "we're going to be mandated to implement something that doesn't feel right for kids," adding that this is the tricky part of maneuvering through policy-level work.

Another policy expert was hopeful that the LOOK Act would provide an opportunity to think differently about language programming and to leverage the native language in a way that SEI failed to do. According to this policy expert, SEI has not shown the academic outcomes they had hoped for, is not financially sustainable, is not great for scheduling, is not great for students, and "it's kind of just not working." This expert feared that the problem with implementing new programs stemming from the LOOK Act will be in changing educators' mindsets, because while it was "somehow super easy" to throw all the materials away, it would not be as easy to go back. This policy expert explained that while Boston may seem progressive on paper, in reality it is a city that maintains a "very majority culture mindset, monolingual, English as a—you know that's just sort of the world we live in, not only post Question 2 but in this political climate." This expert conveyed that there would therefore be "resistance" to changing any school model, but thought that the LOOK Act would have the potential to positively amend the DOJ agreement to different program models other than SEI.

One policy expert hoped to use funds from the LOOK Act to support the expansion of dual language curricula, while two other experts expressed concern that there is not yet a teaching force to support an increase in dual language programming, so one goal would be to

create a pipeline for teachers within Massachusetts universities. One expert described the situation as a "chicken and an egg conversation" because "if we don't yet have the programs 'cause we're waiting on the teachers, then how motivated are the universities going to be in order to create a pipeline and create further qualifications and certifications and requirements for their students if the job that they're waiting for… is not necessarily the one that requires those things yet." Participants expressed mixed emotions over the possible benefits from increased dual language programming that could stem from the LOOK Act, coupled with a fear that there would be resistance to changing community and educators' mindsets about the benefits of multilingual programs. As one participant described, Boston's liberal façade is an obstacle to change, despite the belief that SEI has been unsuccessful.

4.5.14 Summary analysis of findings

The fourth research question aimed to uncover how state and district level education policy experts made sense of the intersection between policy, ELDS, and EBLs. By and large, an overarching theme across agencies was that of the implications of the education accountability system on PreK and a lamentation of the pushdown effect of academically rigorous standards in early childhood. According to participants, this pushdown effect held consequences for several other categories of responses that emerged, including, for example, the pressure of ELDS on teachers, ELDS and vertical transitions, and a need for director support. Findings revealed that across agencies, the majority of policy experts conveyed that ELDS were neither linguistically nor culturally sustaining (Paris, 2012), suggesting that standards should be discussed in-depth as part of a larger systemic approach to educational equity. Moreover, participants emphasized that despite adjustments or accommodations to a standard or instructional practice that teachers may

make, if students are evaluated according to a particular rigid benchmark, then at the end of the day the system disadvantages culturally and linguistically minoritized students.

The study also found that the majority of policy experts believed that ELDS put extra pressure on teachers in their busy and demanding workdays, resulting in a hyper focus on moving students from a to b. While not a discretely coded finding, several participants also reported a discrepancy in the expectations of knowledge and use of ELDS between public PreK programs and local CBO PreK programs, begging the question of why standards may be perceived differently for some programs versus others, and why expectations for their use vary so considerably when expectations for children's school readiness is the same. Half the participants referenced ELDS in the context of the larger educational accountability system that often dictates the curriculum, instruction, and assessments in PreK classrooms, expressing concerns of the pushdown effect wherein PreK standards mimic the academically rigorous standards of higher grades.

For the majority of participants, there was a sense of uncertainty over how the WIDA standards were actually being used by educators, begging the question of why there are disparate expectations for WIDA standards knowledge and application between policy experts and educators. All participants believed that ELDS strengthened children's transitions, and emphasized the importance of kindergarten teachers being aware of preschool expectations so that they can support children when they transition. The majority of participants reported a lack of feedback on ELDS from educators and principals, primarily in understanding how programs are using ELDS, and highlighting how evaluations after professional development sessions are not specific to standards. In Boston, the development of a particular dual language program

resulted in feedback on standards and curriculum alignment, but BPS lacks an organized approach to gather this type of feedback from existing programs.

This study found that half of the participants believed that a teacher's educational background influences their knowledge and utilization of standards, suggesting that if teachers lack content knowledge as well as high expectations for children, they will not be able to teach successfully. Despite the expectation that teachers were integrating all standards into the curriculum, there was also a general sentiment among policy experts that there were too many standards documents, complicating instruction for teachers. The majority of participants feared that the early childhood field sees the multiple documents as distinct and that educators do not understand the logic and continuity to them. This is in many ways unsurprising, since both teacher and policy participants reported that professional development opportunities present on standards in isolation.

Additionally, the study explored how participants reportedly felt about professional development on ELDS. Most participants disclosed their perceptions of a lack of professional development for ELDS (and WIDA standards in particular) among PreK educators. Participants did not know how educators were using WIDA and what types of professional development opportunities were being offered in this area, although they revealed a need for more professional development since teachers were largely on their own to figure out and use standards. Participants spoke of the importance of striking a balance in the standards work and understanding a pedagogy in early childhood that speaks to instructional practices that support young children generally; education therefore must bridge early learning with content and support educators in implementing standards in a developmentally appropriate way. Moreover, participants spoke of the need for ongoing professional development on standards

implementation to support their practice, as opposed to standalone workshops that—for at least one participant—occurred a decade ago.

Half of the policy experts spoke of the importance of having program director or principal support in understanding and implementing standards, suggesting that a lack of leadership in this area can hamper a teacher's ability to effectively utilize standards; developmentally appropriate practices may not come to fruition in the classroom if a teacher is ultimately evaluated according to a different leadership pedagogy. The majority of participants also spoke of a discrepancy in expectations between their respective offices and others that they work with, setting firm yet fuzzy boundaries in terms of their work responsibilities, even for those working directly on early childhood matters at the state level. Given the value that policy experts placed on ELDS as central to a high quality early childhood program, this discrepancy between the agency offices in terms of who does what and who is responsible for what signaled a surprising indifference, or perhaps that standards are a low priority on a long to-do list.

Findings revealed that across agencies, policy experts were frustrated and even angry about the consequences of Question 2 for young EBLs, and optimistic yet cautious over changes stemming from the LOOK Act. By and large, Question 2 created an environment in which policy experts expressed that they were in an impossible position by working against their better judgment of teaching young children. Participants unanimously conveyed that Question 2 contradicted their understanding of how children learn language and greatly disadvantaged EBLs, evident from an increase in special education placement, a rejection of students' native languages and cultures, and an increase in language testing for EBLs. While most policy experts were hopeful that the LOOK Act would provide an opportunity to think differently about language programming, many were cautious that, despite the LOOK Act, the state still lacks a

university pipeline and certifications for educators, predicting that there would be resistance to changing models given the dominant mindset.

4.6 Evaluation of Findings: Teacher and Policy Cross Analysis

4.6.1 Common themes

There were several overlapping areas across interviews with teachers and policy experts, including: the burden of ELDS on teachers; ELDS disadvantaging EBLs; academic pushdown on PreK; reconciling many ELDS documents; perceptions of Question 2; perceptions of the LOOK Act; a language hierarchy for bilingual learning; and teachers' classroom autonomy.

Teachers expressed being burdened and stressed with the emphasis on testing and data collection, often at the expense of playtime, art time, gym time, and social-emotional learning time. Echoing the teachers' concerns, the policy experts believed that standards put extra pressure on teachers in their already demanding workdays, and that teachers see utilizing standards as extra work and burdensome. Indeed, teachers face the challenge of implementing developmentally appropriate practices and modifying instruction for linguistically and culturally minoritized learners, while ultimately being both evaluated as teachers and assessing students on a more rigid set of standards that do not align with those practices.

Teachers and policy experts also intersected in their perceptions of the relationship between ELDS and EBLs. The majority of teachers and policy experts alike conveyed that standards do not consider the cultural and linguistic diversity of their students, and that ELDS may inadvertently disadvantage students by excluding the range of children's development. There was a fear among participants that students are pushed to learn English as quickly as possible, as well as a concern that the WIDA standards are inadequately used as a resource to support educators working with EBLs. Further, there was consensus among both teachers and

policy experts that ELDS themselves were developed from the "dominant culture" and "driven by white middle class values" and therefore the standards were perceived as being inherently inequitable for minoritized learners. Policy experts conveyed that a consequence of this value system—which transcends ELDS and takes into account decades of institutional racism that prevails—is that children of minoritized backgrounds may be retained, suspended, expelled, or generally viewed with lower expectations. At the same time, teachers were unanimously well versed in a variety of ways to modify instruction or differentiate learning activities in order to support their EBLs, largely through small group instruction. However, the double-edged sword is that despite any accommodations or efforts to individualize instruction for EBLs, students are still evaluated according to a particular benchmark, therefore disadvantaging students within this educational accountability system.

Among the many intersecting areas in conversations with teachers and policy experts, a strong consensus existed regarding comments on ELDS and the accountability system in relation to the academic rigor of ELDS that has trickled down to PreK from higher grades. Teachers emphasized the theme of stress on teachers and children—particularly EBLs and children who have recently immigrated—due to increasingly rigorous ELDS. Similarly, policy experts conveyed that there has become a pushdown effect of the accountability system on PreK, resulting in a hyper focus on ELDS in which they have become similar to rigorous standards in higher grades and do not optimize developmentally appropriate learning through play and exploration. Policy experts also explained that in a desire to increase outcomes, ELDS—through a "drill and kill approach—are widening the [achievement] gaps and leading to [student] disengagement."

Additionally, teachers and policy experts alike explained that using ELDS documents was complicated given the discrepancy between the expectations of their use and the disjointed nature of the documents themselves. The majority of teachers claimed that they did not consult the various ELDS on a regular basis, describing use of the standards as "tiresome." Similarly, policy experts expressed that there were too many standards documents, complicating instruction for teachers, yet the expectation was that programs integrated all standards. Despite this expectation, policy experts could not reveal professional development opportunities or presentations where ELDS have not been executed in isolation, presenting on just one of the documents. Educators validated policy experts' concerns that the ECE field sees ELDS as very distinct documents. Moreover, despite their stated significance, the majority of policy experts were unclear how ELDS were being enforced at the program level, stating that it was "just a given" and that these interview questions raised important questions for policy experts to think about, signaling a need to better understand how standards are developed and implemented in practice.

There was overlap between teachers and policy experts in their perceptions of Question 2. Both teachers and policy experts alike unanimously underscored the negative impacts of Question 2 on students, teachers, and on society at large. Teachers identified a conflict between the language politics of Question 2 coupled with a political climate that vilifies immigrants under the Trump administration, and the realities of their diverse classrooms. Indeed, teachers conveyed that individuals in positions of political power were detached from the realities of the classroom and what was developmentally appropriate. One policy expert echoed these concerns in expressing dismay over allowing people without background context or knowledge to make decisions, underscoring the inequities within a political system largely driven by white, middle-

class people. A teacher similarly underscored how the students who could have benefited did not have the same access to this type of programing as children in wealthier communities whose parents had the resources and wherewithal to fight for it. These comments raise the question of whether Question 2 should ever have been a ballot measure, and who should be able to make decisions about education policy. As a ballot measure, the public was the decision-making authority as opposed to state or local school boards. The concept of Question 2 as a ballot measure was called out by participants who questioned how the state allowed the public to eliminate bilingual education for its students; while theoretically a democratic approach, in reality, those who voted were most likely white, middle class, and relatively unaffected themselves by the decision. Indeed, participants conveyed that Question 2 perpetuated and opened the proficiency gap and affirmed that their data speaks volumes to this discrepancy.

Teachers and policy experts conveyed that Question 2 created a challenging learning environment for EBLs in which the English-only narrative undervalued their languages and cultures, was "damaging" to students, and which could attribute to the high attrition rates for EBLs. Policy experts explained that Question 2 legislation contradicted their understanding of how children learn language and actually disadvantaged EBLs in its failure to demonstrate an understanding of how language develops despite the research on brain and language development. Several teachers were emotional while sharing their perspectives of the extent to which the political climate demonized EBLs, particularly in an environment within which bilingual materials were trashed and teachers were told to speak in English when someone came to their classroom door. Further, teachers and policy experts alike shared their concerns over the impact of Question 2 on teachers and students, with several citing Latinx teachers feeling

discouraged to teach, the heavy burden on teachers in testing young EBL children, the related costs of increased testing, and over-referrals for special education.

Teachers and policy experts were additionally aligned in their thoughts on the LOOK Act, although only half of the teachers interviewed were familiar with the legislation. While several participants were optimistic about how the legislation may positively influence education for EBLs and impart a sense of pride in bilingualism, most were more cautious over how the legislation may manifest. Some participants worried that the funds would ultimately support students in higher socioeconomic and well-resourced towns, as opposed to places with higher immigrant populations that could most benefit. One policy expert feared a situation where another ballot question would arise and upend children's education yet again, while another participant questioned what happened to the children who were in between Question 2 and the LOOK Act, suggesting that experimenting on children's educational experiences is risky and could have long-term impacts that we may never fully understand. Others feared that changing educators' mindsets to become more open to a range of dual language programming would be one of the biggest challenges given that there is a majority culture mindset, despite the perception that Boston is, in the words of one policy expert, "liberal on paper."

There was also an overlapping reference between teachers and policy experts to a language hierarchy that polarizes language learners into the categories of those learning English as a second language and monolingual English speakers. Within this hierarchy, English speakers are praised for attaining bilingual status, while paradoxically the language achievement expectations for students learning English as a second language are much lower. Teachers referred to this language hierarchy as a double standard that places a higher value on learning a second language for monolingual English speakers, offering them a competitive advantage in

college admissions and the workforce, while it does not similarly benefit students of lower socioeconomic status.

Finally, there was an overlapping reference between teachers and policy experts to teachers' autonomy, suggesting that despite any laws or mandates to utilize a particular method or assessment, teachers ultimately do what they want to do. Several teachers explained that despite any laws, they do what they want, close their doors, and "ignore" until someone tells them otherwise. Several policy experts acknowledged this too, with one expert asserting that if teachers disagree with something, "they'll just do what they want to do anyways," referring to the influence of teacher autonomy in the classroom.

These areas of intersection between teachers and policy experts underscore how a negative political climate for EBLs involving a longstanding institutional legacy has perpetuated a language hierarchy for bilingual learning, undermined EBLs' knowledge and skillsets, and cultivated a xenophobic environment for students and teachers. These language power dynamics—coupled with the academic pushdown of the educational accountability system on PreK—have fostered an environment in which teachers are not fully prepared to work with minoritized learners on the expectations for student outcomes.

4.6.2 Areas of difference across themes

While there were many areas of intersection in conversations with both teachers and policy experts, there were also several areas of difference, including: influence of teacher's language or educational backgrounds; perceptions of preparation on ELDS; and several themes described below that surfaced for policy experts or teachers, but not for both.

Across participants, the majority conveyed that a teacher's background influences their practices and use of ELDS. Four teacher participants all learned English as a second language, or

were themselves immigrants to the United States, and they explained that their backgrounds influenced their teaching of EBLs and their desire to instill pride in their students' bilingualism. However, while the teachers emphasized their own language backgrounds, policy experts emphasized teachers' educational backgrounds. Policy experts believed that a teacher's educational background influences their knowledge and utilization of ELDS, and if they are unable to do instructional practices, or do not hold high expectations for their students, they will not know how to support children's learning.

Teachers and policy experts were also misaligned in their perceptions of preparation on ELDS. Despite the majority of teachers proclaiming their confidence and knowledge of the various ELDS, few teachers reported prior education on working with ELDS, while the majority reported receiving in-service professional development on working with ELDS, ranging from infrequent to intensive. On the other hand, policy experts believed that PreK educators lacked preparation for ELDS, and WIDA in particular. While there was consensus among policy experts that teachers lacked sufficient professional development, policy experts contended that they lacked the resources and the capacity to meet that need, and also were faced with competing priorities. Moreover, policy experts conveyed that despite the importance of standards as the guideposts for all that should be covered, teachers were oftentimes handed the standards but they were ultimately left to figure out how to implement them on their own. There was evidently a difference in perspective on what constituted sufficient professional development for ELDS between teachers and policy experts.

Several other themes that surfaced for policy experts did not surface for teachers, and vice versa. The themes of directors needing more support and the discrepancy in agency office responsibilities were unsurprisingly unique to the policy experts. On the other hand, there were

several themes that were unique to the teachers, including for example: the role of the paraprofessional, evaluating EBLs' progress, teacher's ability to communicate in a child's native language, negative language or attitude towards EBLs, disability or language barrier, communicating with families, and assumptions or biases about EBLs.

4.6.3 Summary of findings

Interviews with teachers and policy experts point to a broader policy context in which standards should be discussed as part of a larger systemic approach to educational equity. Responses from teachers and policy experts were fraught with dissatisfaction with the scope, education, and expectations around standards use, a finding worth noting in the context of educational policy decisions. The most poignant comments underscored participants' frustration with the academic pushdown of the accountability system on PreK, including utilization of academically rigorous standards. The emphasis on ELDS disadvantages EBLs who may need more social and emotional support instead of assessments that cause undue stress on children. Participants also conveyed that in failing to recognize the cultural and linguistic diversity of their students, ELDS can disadvantage students. Participants emphasized the need to focus on the development of a child's native language in order to help close achievement gaps later on.

Findings revealed that teachers lack adequate preparation to support the learning and development of EBLs and to implement ELDS. Despite the 2010 DOJ lawsuit (see section 3.1 on the lawsuit) which found that teachers were inadequately prepared to teach EBLs, particularly in SEI classrooms, ten years later many teachers are still ill-equipped to work with their EBLs. Teachers also lack pedagogically sound instructional support from their principals or directors. Teachers are often on their own in terms of understanding and implementing ELDS and they lack coaching and professional learning communities, often seeking support on their own and

advocating for their own needs outside of the school community. Despite teachers' best efforts to adjust instructional practices or modify standards to support linguistically and culturally minoritized children, teachers and students are at a disadvantage in that they are evaluated according to a benchmark norm consistent with the broader educational accountability system. Standards, while considered to be at the heart of early childhood educational equity and quality, unintentionally can undermine children's unique cultural and linguistic assets. Standards can foster an environment in which diversity—while glorified as an advantage—masks a classroom façade behind which it is sometimes considered an inconvenience and a drawback to educational success. Diversity is not celebrated, as it should be, and instead is inconveniently slotted away.

Assumptions and biases about EBL student achievement, which were present across program types, hold implications for how teachers work with EBLs, and provoke the deeper question of how mindsets can be shifted in light of the LOOK Act to support dual language programming. Perceptions of language learning as an asset versus as detrimental to learning English vary widely. Relatedly, this research has shown that there is a language hierarchy that both values particular English accents and particular languages over others. Teachers referred to this language hierarchy as a "double standard" that places a higher value on learning a second language for monolingual English speakers, offering them a competitive advantage in college admissions and the workforce, while it does not similarly benefit students of lower socioeconomic status. This language hierarchy was also present in teachers' disapproval over the attention that a Haitian Creole program received over Spanish dual language programs, suggesting that Spanish dual language programs hold more value. Further display of the language hierarchy in practice was in a dual language teacher's story of being criticized for her

English accent as a pre-service education student, and not being allowed to teach the phonics part of the lesson "because my pronunciation was not American."

These confounding values result in a pattern of inadequate and superficial opportunities for immigrant parents as they volunteer in the classroom, and for immigrant teachers as they navigate classroom politics. Overall, participants conveyed that a Eurocentric approach to education, white dominant culture, and xenophobic collective mindset contributed to their skeptical views on Question 2 and the LOOK Act, influenced the quality, scope, and priority of preparation on ELDS and EBLs, and contributed to the proliferation of a language hierarchy that undermines EBLs and their language capabilities. The following chapter outlines implications stemming from these findings and recommendations for policy changes, in particular related to teacher education and ELDS development and monitoring.

Chapter V – IMPLICATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CONCLUSION

5.1 Introduction

The purpose of this study was to understand the interplay between ELDS and EBLs in PreK classrooms in Boston, Massachusetts. The study sought to understand how preschool teachers and policy personnel themselves understand these standards. Moreover, it sought to understand how teachers integrate ELDS with their practice generally, and specifically with regard to their EBL students. To do so, it sought to understand the ways in which EBLs are positioned in ECE Massachusetts' standards; how ELDS are understood, perceived, and enacted in PreK classrooms in Boston; and how state and district level education policy experts perceive the relationships between Massachusetts language policy, ELDS, and the needs of young EBL students. By asking about perceptions and attitudes of teachers and policy experts regarding ELDS in the research questions, the study hoped to contextualize ELDS within a sociocultural framework in order to provide an understanding of the role of standards in the early education of EBLs.

The findings from this study revealed that teachers and policy experts alike were dissatisfied with the scope, education, and expectations surrounding standards use, and were frustrated with the academic pushdown of the accountability system on PreK. Participants conveyed that ELDS can disadvantage students in failing to recognize their cultural and linguistic repertoires as assets to be celebrated and nurtured. Findings revealed a need for adequate teacher preparation to support EBLs and to implement ELDS. Moreover, assumptions and biases about EBL student achievement hold implications for how teachers work with EBLs and perceptions of ability versus disability. Findings point to a broader policy context in which

standards and their Eurocentric approach to education must be revisited as part of a systemic approach to educational equity.

5.2 Implications

The purpose of this qualitative study was to examine the interplay between ELDS and EBLs in PreK classrooms in Boston, Massachusetts. The findings of this study contribute to the current body of knowledge regarding ELDS and EBLs by investigating how EBLs are positioned within ELDS documents, and providing data on the perceptions of preschool teachers and state and district education policy experts as these professionals develop and implement ELDS for EBLs.

This study holds implications for the development and revision of ELDS as it reveals the inherent bias in the very creation of the standards and its related impact on the content. The individuals who establish standards assume their own developmental trajectories to be the norm, to the exclusion of children who are not part of the Eurocentric culture, dominant in the U.S., and whose minoritized backgrounds are consequently forgotten (Rogoff, 2003).

By highlighting teacher and policy perceptions of ELDS, and their relationship to EBL students, this study may help maximize the uses and benefits of ELDS, inform policy formation for EBLs, and improve pre-service and in-service teacher education to develop supportive instructional strategies for educators. Findings from this study may also help inform other state policies where ELDS are utilized with a large population of EBLs. Moreover, understanding the perceived implications of policy decisions such as Question 2 may equip educators and policy makers with practical knowledge that can inform future comparable ballot measures.

There is no one-size-fits-all model for teaching EBLs, and this research could help guide districts that want to expand options for EBLs. Teachers in all program types (in particular

general education and SEI) would benefit from broader preparation on how to work with EBL children, whose various cultures and languages may represent different approaches to learning, language, and communication development.

Increased outreach to families can ensure that parents are informed about the value and benefits of dual language instruction for their child. Increased attention to a child's initial enrollment processes including forms and home language surveys, coupled with a better understanding of their potent consequences for a child's school placement, may support families as they navigate formal PreK options. It is also important to ensure that parents understand the benefits of enrollment in early childhood education.

What are the implications for education policy if the EBLs served in PreK programs are placed in classrooms where teachers may be ill-equipped to support minoritized learners? Findings from this study suggest that teachers across program types would benefit from diversity education, as well as preparation on understanding and implementing ELDS for EBLs. These findings signal the continued importance of confronting ideological obstacles that impact EBLs' learning, including teacher biases, institutional values, language power dynamics, and widespread xenophobia. Researchers and policy experts point to the growing number of EBLs in the United States and their comparatively low gains in academic achievement. While providing more dual language programs may be one way to address this issue, it is impractical to assume that EBLs would necessarily attend these programs if offered, particularly given the evidence from this study suggesting that many parents favor programs with English instruction. Consequently, more attention is needed to address teacher education and attitudes towards increasingly diverse classrooms as a practical approach to supporting EBLs.

5.3 Relationships to Theories

There are several connections between the findings of the study and the literature review, which hold implications for how sociocultural theories of learning can be applied to research on ELDS and EBLs. This research used Vygotsky's sociocultural theory of learning to better understand the ways in which teachers report scaffolding within an EBL child's ZPD as well as how ELDS play a role in assisting this scaffolding. According to Vygotsky, when educators build upon the pre-existing infrastructure of knowledge that a child has acquired (scaffolding), learning takes place in a social process as part of a child's ZPD. This is consistent with the dual language and SEI teachers' practices as they leveraged children's home languages, cultures, and knowledge as supportive scaffolding tools. Moreover, all teachers in the study were well versed in ways to modify instruction or differentiate learning activities in order to support their EBLs, largely through small group instruction. However, the general education teachers by and large struggled to incorporate children's home languages into classroom practices as well as struggled to communicate with families, in this way failing to incorporate children's languages as scaffolding tools.

Vygotsky also closely linked language and cognitive development, implying that a failure to adequately consider a child's native language and culture could negatively impact a student's cognitive development. In line with Vygotsky's connection between language and cognitive development, most teachers in the study conveyed that a failure to incorporate a child's native language and culture into classroom instruction could negatively impact a child's development. At the same time, many teachers referenced the external negative language or attitudes towards EBLs that they witnessed in their school environments or in society, a hallmark of an English-speaking majority culture mindset. These external attitudes and teachers' contempt for programs

that encourage native language development negatively impact students, as students are aware of teachers' disapproval of nurturing their native language. This disapproval stands in stark contrast to Vygotsky's connection between nurturing a child's native language and cognitive development, suggesting that EBLs in PreK classrooms could be negatively impacted by an English-only mindset that permeates their school environment. Further, related to the need for diversity and anti-bias education, half of the teachers in the study revealed personal assumptions or biases about their EBL students. For example, one teacher feared that dual language programs may leave students with "less English skills" and that this would impact their future academic prospects. These biases can explicitly or implicitly translate into classroom instructional practices, impacting students and derailing Vygotsky's critical link between language and cognitive development.

Like Vygotsky's ZPD, Rogoff (1990) suggests that guidance and participation in culturally important activities are critical for children's learning and development. Her theory of the cultural nature of human development emphasizes how individuals develop within their cultural communities, where culture is dynamic and constantly evolving. Rogoff's sociocultural approach is critical of using Eurocentric practices as benchmarks of a child's rate of development, acknowledging the need to define developmental benchmarks that take local culture into account. Rogoff used a "racetrack" as a cultural metaphor for development, arguing that the haste to teach academic preschool is based on the cultural community of the dominant group in society and does not reflect minoritized backgrounds and cultures. Relatedly, teachers and policy experts conveyed that there was a hyper focus on ELDS in which they have become similar to rigorous standards in higher grades and do not optimize developmentally appropriate learning through play and exploration. Participants explained that this emphasis on ELDS

disadvantages EBLs who may need more social and emotional support instead of a focus on rigorous standards.

Consistent with Rogoff's theoretical approach, teachers and policy experts conveyed that standards did not fully consider the cultural and linguistic diversity of their students, and that ELDS may inadvertently disadvantage students in narrowing the range of children's development. Rogoff (2003) found that individuals who establish standards assume their own developmental trajectories to be the norm, to the exclusion of those held by non-dominant, ethnically and linguistically minoritized people. Similarly, there was consensus among teachers and policy experts that ELDS themselves were developed from the "dominant culture" and "driven by white, middle-class values," and therefore the standards were perceived as an inequitable hierarchy that precludes the range of development in young children. Policy experts conveyed that a consequence of this value system is that children of minoritized backgrounds may be retained, suspended, expelled, or generally viewed with lower expectations.

5.4 Recommendations

Based on the themes and patterns that emerged from the study, recommendations—grouped into 12 categories—are offered and described below in more detail: Theorizing the purpose and utility of ELDS; ELDS development; assessments for EBLs; diverse workforce; pre-service education on EBLs and ELDS; in-service education on EBLs and ELDS; communication with families; paraprofessionals and support staff; K1 school attendance and EBL enrollment form; LOOK Act recommendations; ELDS monitoring and feedback; and reconciling state and district ECE expectations.

5.4.1 Theorizing the purpose and utility of ELDS

It is time for a paradigm shift in theorizing the purpose and utility of ELDS; they must be reviewed in-depth as part of a larger systemic approach to educational equity, careful considering the extent to which they are linguistically and culturally sustaining (Paris, 2012). Massachusetts' myriad standards documents should be consolidated, as they are incoherent in such large numbers, rendering them impractical tools for educators. These multiple documents make implementation success, no matter how rich or abundant the professional development, next to impossible. Additionally, standards should be regularly updated as new research emerges. The documents do not fully reflect cultural variants and must be revisited by individuals from minoritized backgrounds to do so. Indeed, the issue of inherent bias in the development of ELDS—and consequently their content—leads to the recommendation regarding the review of all standards. Education should be predicated on these revised and far more streamlined culturally appropriate standards.

State and district policy experts should be mindful of the academic pushdown effect in early childhood and emphasize the importance of culturally and linguistically inclusive practices in PreK classrooms, underscoring play and social and emotional learning above rigorous standards. Standards should serve as guideposts for what children should know and be able to do, but young children should not be held to rigid benchmarks. Policy experts must consider how a failure to take these practices to heart could result in perpetuating a system that disadvantages EBLs, as they may continue to be evaluated according to norms that do not necessarily align with those of culturally or linguistically minoritized students.

5.4.2 ELDS development

Interviews with teachers revealed that in the writing and rewriting of standards, state policy experts should pay closer attention to how ELDS are developed with EBLs in mind. They must carefully consider their own positions of power in the development of ELDS in order to be inclusive of other value systems. Teachers—while involved in the development of Massachusetts standards—must become even more involved in the work of ELDS development and revisions as they hold critical content knowledge and practical insights into their instructional use.

5.4.3 Assessments for EBLs

Given the increasing emphasis on assessments administered to young EBLs—which teachers reported detracted from getting to know the children and actually teaching them—BPS must determine the number and nature of assessments, including how tests are administered, what data are produced, and how those data are used. Perhaps moving forward there is a way to better consolidate data collection for multiple assessments in order to decrease assessments for EBLs and alleviate the cycle of "just testing and monitoring and testing and monitoring which doesn't really allow you to teach." For example, several teachers described having to administer at least five different assessments to their EBLs at the beginning, middle, and then again at the end of the year—and each one is administered one-on-one. These assessments include, but are not limited to, the Phonological Awareness Literacy Screening (PALS), Expressive Vocabulary Test (EVT), a modified version of the K2 BPS math assessment, the WIDA-ACCESS Placement Test (W-APT), the WIDA ACCESS for ELLs test, Concepts About Print Assessment, in addition to other progress monitoring.

Guzman-Orth, López, and Tolentino (2017) propose a dual language assessment framework that assumes that languages are part of a dynamic system in which their interactions

over time are multifaceted and multidirectional, with each language system influencing and being influenced by the other. This framework assumes that EBLs develop proficiencies in two languages and that they navigate these languages simultaneously. Guzman-Orth, López, and Tolentino (2017) recommend using their assessment framework—which includes components such as construct, tasks, purpose, scoring and reporting, test administration, and examiner—to measure language and literacy knowledge, skills, or abilities that EBLs should develop prior to entering kindergarten. The framework is intended be used alongside the state or local English language proficiency assessment as well as parent feedback about their child's language and literacy development. The BPS Office of English Learners should therefore determine which assessments are critical for initial and ongoing assessment, using formal assessments as well as informal observational tools to provide a comprehensive picture of each child's progress. BPS would also benefit from looking into the validity of the aforementioned assessments for EBLs.

5.4.4 Diverse workforce

There is strong evidence that students and teachers alike would benefit from a more diverse workforce, and steps should be taken to encourage Latinx teachers in particular to pursue early childhood education degrees. For schools to effectively support minoritized communities, more teachers and paraprofessionals from different backgrounds need to be hired for those jobs. Innovative and affordable pathways for educators—particularly historically underrepresented groups in higher education—must be made available through two and four-year colleges. Programs should emphasize coursework that is paired with on-site job education and apprenticeship. An increasingly multilingual workforce could give teachers unique insight into how children learn language, how to incorporate culturally and linguistically sound instructional practices, and how to effectively communicate with families.

5.4.5 Pre-service preparation on EBLs and ELDS

There is evidently a need to revisit the expectations for early childhood educators upon graduating from their pre-service programs to ensure program quality, particularly given participants' beliefs that a teacher's educational background influences their knowledge and utilization of standards. Policy experts believed that if teachers lack content knowledge as well as high expectations for children, they would not be able to teach successfully. Policy experts' perceptions of a lack of preparation on ELDS, coupled with teachers' perceptions of a lack of pre-service education on ELDS, suggest a need for pre-service programs to look closely at how they incorporate ELDS into their curriculum in order to better support how teachers understand and can utilize ELDS in their classrooms, and how to apply ELDS to EBLs in practice.

Moreover, SEI teacher endorsement courses should be reviewed to ensure that understanding and implementing ELDS for EBLs is an essential component of the curriculum. As DeBruin-Parecki and Slutzky (2016) attest, "having standards is not enough;" teachers benefit from teaching strategies and examples on how to use them in their classrooms and also how to go "beyond teaching to one standard at a time" (p. 30). State and district leaders must also work closely with higher education institutions to keep them informed of any revisions to ELDS, as this will enable updated information to be integrated into early childhood teacher education classes, and can positively influence standards-based instruction. Based on the participants' reported experiences, pre-service programs should likewise improve their curricula to better support teachers on working with EBLs. Education should consider incorporating a variety of user-friendly platforms, including online modules, in-person education, and coaching.

5.4.6 In-service education and professional development on EBLs and ELDS

BPS as a district should put more funds into in-service professional development supports around working with EBLs. There is also evidently a need for increased diversity and anti-bias education for all teachers. This type of education may help teachers confront personal biases and reduce or ideally prevent prejudiced teaching practices. In-service educational opportunities must be ongoing to support teachers' practices; evidently introductory professional development that veteran teachers took years ago are insufficient, and may be indicative of how deep-rooted assumptions can be about student achievement, and how challenging it can be to try to change teachers' mindsets. Particular attention should be given to general education teachers and SEI teachers working with minoritized student populations, as they seemed to be most in need of diversity and anti-bias education.

State and district education leaders must also find ways to better support program directors and principals in understanding and implementing standards through professional development opportunities, as a lack of leadership in this area can evidently hamper a teacher's ability to effectively use ELDS. State and district administrators should ensure that education on ELDS consider a holistic approach to meeting standards so that teachers are not hyper focused on moving students from a to b, but rather embrace the continuity of learning for young children that aligns PreK ELDS with those of the toddler and kindergarten years. Education should therefore present on the logic and continuity to all standards documents. Professional development must bridge early learning with content and support educators in developmentally appropriate standards implementation through ELDS-supported activities and learning centers. These professional development opportunities must be continually updated and ongoing, and

should provide user-friendly resources both in-person, online, and through coaching, in order to reach teachers with varying education levels and backgrounds.

Additionally, teachers desire professional learning communities to share helpful strategies. These professional communities are learning teams in which teachers discuss goals, analyze data, share strategies, and discuss practices to meet the needs of all learners. Principals and program directors should work with teachers to create educational opportunities that meet teachers' scheduling and instructional needs, including breaking down ELDS by language needs for EBLs, providing more support with implementation, and cultivating "professional learning communities" to share instructional strategies.

5.4.7 Communication with families

Teachers need supportive guidance and tools on positive communication with families. Many teachers struggled to genuinely connect with families, which impacted the extent to which their instructional practices were culturally and linguistically inclusive of student backgrounds. The teachers that communicated most successfully with families used mobile phone applications, such as ClassDojo, Seesaw, or TalkingPoints, suggesting a need for increased attention and funding for these valuable communication tools. The ClassDojo app builds a classroom community where students, teachers, and families share photos, videos, and announcements. Through the Seesaw app, students demonstrate their learning within a digital portfolio, which is then shared with teachers to understand their progress, and with families to share student learning and engage with the school. TalkingPoints is an app that focuses on family engagement for families of under-resourced, multilingual communities, and automatically translates messages to families to ensure seamless communication. Teachers can also maintain communication with families through regular phone call check-ins, and by using communication folders that go back

and forth between the teacher and the families. Moreover, monolingualism was an obstacle for teachers in communicating with families, suggesting that bilingualism should be encouraged for teachers of EBLs in K1.

5.4.8 Paraprofessionals and support staff

There is evidently a need for greater appreciation, preparation, and professional development supports for paraprofessionals given the critical roles that they play in the day-to-day functioning of the classroom. Teachers and students alike would benefit from the support of a multilingual paraprofessional who is able to communicate in the children's home language(s). There is also inequitable access to expert school support staff across schools, including speech therapists and occupational therapists who play an important role in supporting EBLs and determining their needs and services. BPS should work to ensure that teachers are not on their own in diagnosing language barriers or alternative learning needs and that they have these vital support staff in their schools. It is important for these professionals to be knowledgeable on the identification of EBLs in particular, as many assessments that are valid for monolingual learners, are not for EBLs.

5.4.9 K1 school attendance and EBL enrollment form

BPS district leaders should take a closer look at school placement patterns, as teachers across program types revealed their frustrations with a selection process that designates a classroom seat to a particular child regardless of their actual attendance. Communication with the families of EBLs must be increased to convince them of the importance of K1 attendance to provide a strong foundation for early learning. Further, students continue to be under-identified as English speakers and miss out on essential services, despite the 2010 DOJ lawsuit (see section 3.1 on the lawsuit). BPS must therefore take a closer look at how students are placed and work

intently with families to provide EBLs with developmentally appropriate services that meet EBLs' needs.

5.4.10 LOOK Act recommendations

While the LOOK Act marks an important step towards providing more equitable educational opportunities for EBLs, more work needs to be done in communities to bolster dual language programs, change resisting mindsets, and develop a pipeline for educators to work with EBLs. Programs that develop with LOOK Act funds should favor a heteroglossic approach that views languages as interactive, complimentary, and fluid, as opposed to a monoglossic approach in which languages are strictly separated and students are not allowed to translanguage or speak their own languages (García & Beardsmore, 2008; García & Torres-Guevara, 2010). Additionally, given that few teachers were familiar with the LOOK Act, there is a need for more informed policy dissemination in schools from principal or program director leadership to teachers.

5.4.11 ELDS monitoring and feedback

Interviews confirmed the need for an increased focus on ELDS monitoring and feedback following professional development, particularly given the disparate expectations for standards knowledge and application between policy experts and teachers, and the uncertainty amongst policy experts over how standards were actually used by educators. Policy experts lacked feedback on ELDS from educators and principals, primarily in understanding how programs use ELDS, and they highlighted how evaluations after education sessions lacked specificity on standards. The need for this type of feedback became apparent during an interview with a policy expert when she requested taking the interview questions into a meeting with colleagues to discuss how ELDS are rolled out and supported, an indication that there is a need to better

understand ELDS use and implementation, and to develop systems at the state and district levels for improved monitoring and feedback. Following education sessions regarding revisions to ELDS, EEC could send needs-assessment surveys to educators and principals to better understand to what extent they understand and utilize the standards, and how they could be supported in ELDS implementation.

5.4.12 Reconciling state and district ECE expectations

Given the discrepancy in expectations between state and district education agencies and their respective offices that they collaborate with, there is a need for agencies to come together through regular working groups to establish clear boundaries and work responsibilities related to early childhood in order to work together more cohesively. Evidently, boundaries of work responsibilities between offices are unclear, as participants reported that EEC and DESE often defer to the other for early childhood related tasks, and neither wants to overstep in the other's space, which can result in inefficiencies and a lack of leadership.

5.4.13 Future research

There are several possible areas for further inquiry stemming from this research. There appeared to be a hierarchy within the dual language programs themselves over which languages held more perceived power or value. For example, several teachers were displeased with the attention that a Haitian Creole program received over Spanish dual language programs, signaling the influence of language hierarchies in practice. Research could explore innovative ways in which dual language programs are successfully interrupting the neoliberal paradigm that devalues minoritized languages, instead empowering EBLs and their learning experiences.

Another area for further research could explore whether having separate standards documents for EBLs—such as WIDA—unintentionally creates more separation and confusion

for teachers of EBLs and therefore causes more harm than good. Would it be more helpful for teachers to have EBL standards interwoven with general education standards? Given that so many students are not meeting grade-level standards, should the focus be on modifying the standards themselves that may not be grade or content appropriate, or should the focus be on tailoring instruction and curriculum and supporting teachers?

An additional area of potential research could explore the circumstances around the formation of a working group on dual language learners within the Boston Teachers Union in fall of 2019, while my study was already underway. I found that teachers created this working group as a direct result of a perceived lack of professional development on this issue within BPS. Another area for future research could look into pre-service programs to identify if there is a need to improve teacher education curricula and how. My study provides a foundation for researching these, and other, important corollary lines of inquiry.

5.5 Conclusion

While taking a lead in many educational areas, Massachusetts has a way to go for EBLs, and the study points the way to many suggestions that include: reviewing and consolidating standards, education and professional development (pre-service and in-service), policy changes in entry procedures for EBLs, more nuanced understandings of the inherent biases that undergird serving this population equitably, a heteroglossic view of dual language assessments, increasing workforce diversity, supporting the role of the paraprofessional, better and regular communication with families, increased monitoring and feedback of ELDS, reconciling state and district ECE expectations, and more policy focus on EBLs.

This study found that Vygotsky and Rogoff's sociocultural theories of learning are helpful in framing understandings of ELDS in their development and in practice. Using this

sociocultural theoretical lens allowed for more depth in understanding the power dynamics in the development of ELDS, including reflecting on the dominant benchmarks considered in the writing of standards. As part of a larger systemic approach to educational equity, ELDS should be carefully reviewed—with widespread stakeholder feedback—within the context of a Eurocentric orientation of ELDS in order to influence the nature of the standards themselves. Using a sociocultural theoretical lens also allowed for more depth in understanding the implementation of ELDS, including how children's native languages and cultures are impacted by perceptions of EBL ability and achievement. The study evolved from the increasingly widespread recognition that ELDS are a valued and purposeful tool for supporting children's school readiness, and from an understanding of the time, resources, and energy needed to develop, revise, and implement ELDS. ELDS are generative in that they guide educators and practitioners in developing their own understanding of how young children develop and use language in the classroom. While ELDS offer guidance in organizing instruction, it is important to note that they are only one of many tools to support children's learning and language development in early childhood.

Standards are here to stay, so they must be as relevant and culturally responsive as possible. This study found that until ELDS documents begin to include the cultural and linguistic diversity of students within the expectations, they may continue to disadvantage EBL students. The document analysis confirmed that in general, EBL inclusion within ELDS documents is inconsistent and limited to introductory or concluding material, or scattered throughout the domains. Moreover, the document analysis revealed that the Massachusetts ELDS are inconsistent in their information and interpretation of EBL learning and development according to current research; they variably depict EBLs through a positive asset-based or negative deficit-

based lens, and highlight development from an English-dominant perspective. While a Massachusetts policies and guidelines document emphasizes the need for ongoing professional development on working with EBLs, interviews with teachers suggest that these sessions are likely not even occurring.

This study found that teachers and policy experts were largely dissatisfied with the scope, education, and expectations around standards use and implementation. Participants were frustrated with the academic pushdown of the accountability system on PreK, including utilization of academically rigorous standards in place of developmentally appropriate, linguistically and culturally sustaining early childhood pedagogical practices. Culturally sustaining practices move away from the dominant Eurocentric educational norms often imposed by ELDS and honor multilingualism and multiculturalism (Paris & Alim, 2017). Despite teachers' best efforts to modify ELDS to support linguistically and culturally minoritized students, teachers and students are at a disadvantage in that they are evaluated according to benchmark norms for what students are expected to know and be able to do, consistent with the educational accountability system. Teachers are evaluated by a classroom rubric according to priority indicators that include how they implement standards-based units (MA DESE, 2019). The unintended consequence of this double-edged sword is that teachers are trapped in an accountability paradox where they must adhere to rigid ELDS while at the same time attempt to nurture children's linguistic and cultural funds of knowledge. Disproportionality in educational experiences and outcomes will likely persist unless there is a concerted effort to nurture children's multilingualism and multiculturalism.

Early childhood teacher education must emphasize anti-bias, anti-racist developmentally appropriate practices and cultural and linguistic diversity as a holistic approach to pedagogy for

young learners (Souto-Manning et al., 2019). Indeed, a decade after the 2010 DOJ lawsuit which found that teachers were inadequately prepared to work with EBL students, teachers still lack adequate education in working with EBLs and in implementing ELDS. Teachers need increased support and professional development and principal support around instructional practices, and until these are implemented they will remain largely on their own in terms of understanding and implementing ELDS. Moreover, teachers come to the classroom with preconceived assumptions and biases about EBL student achievement, which raises the question of how to shift teachers' mindsets to perceive linguistic and cultural diversity as an asset. Without concerted efforts to include diversity education in pre-service programs, these biases will continue to impact how teachers work with EBLs.

There is strong evidence that students and teachers alike would benefit from a more diverse workforce, and pathways should be offered to encourage Latinx teachers in particular to pursue early childhood education degrees. The pattern of references to teachers who themselves learned English as a second language and its profound impact on their practice suggests that an increasingly diverse workforce could give teachers unique insight into how children learn to make meaning and make sense—to communicate across named languages, how to incorporate culturally and linguistically sound teaching practices, and how to effectively communicate with and learn from families.

REFERENCES

Abbot, M. G., Caccavale, T. S., & Stewart, K. (2007). Cognitive benefits of learning language. *Duke Gifted Letter, 8*(1).

Abedi, J. (2004). The No Child Left Behind Act and English language learners: Assessment and accountability issues. *Educational Researcher, 33*(1), 4-14.

Adelson, V., Geva, E., & Fraser, C. (2014, March). Identification, assessment, and instruction of English language learners with learning difficulties in the elementary and intermediate grades. *University of Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.* http://www.ctserc.org/assets/documents/initiatives/specific-learning-disabilities-dyslexia/archive/ELLs-with-special-needs.pdf

Adolph, K. E., & Berger, S. E. (2015). Physical and motor development. In M. H. Bornstein & M. E. Lamb (Eds.), *Developmental science: An advanced textbook*, (7th ed., pp. 261-333). Psychology Press/Taylor & Francis.

Adolph, K. E., & Robinson, S. R. (2015). Motor development. *Handbook of Child Psychology and Developmental Science, 2*(4), 1-45.

American Immigration Council. (2017, October 5). *Immigrants in Massachusetts*. https://www.americanimmigrationcouncil.org/research/immigrants-in-massachusetts

American Psychological Association, Presidential Task Force on Educational Disparities. (2012). *Ethnic and racial disparities in education: Psychology's contributions to understanding and reducing disparities.* https://www.apa.org/ed/resources/racial-disparities.pdf

Anderson, M. L. (2014). Multiple inference and gender differences in the effects of early intervention: A reevaluation of the Abecedarian, Perry preschool, and early training projects. *Journal of the American Statistical Association, 103*(484), 1481-1495.

Ansari, A., & López, M. (2015, September). *Preparing low-income Latino children for kindergarten and beyond: How children in Miami's publicly funded preschool programs fare.* National Research Center on Hispanic Children and Families. http://www.childtrends.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/Hispanic-Center-MSRP-Brief-FINAL.pdf

Ascenzi-Moreno, L. (2017). From deficit to diversity: How teachers of recently arrived emergent bilinguals negotiate ideological and pedagogical change. *Schools: Studies in Education, 14*(2), 276-302.

Atencio, D. J. (2012). *Necessary dispositions for teachers working with young dual language learners.* Dual language learner teacher competencies (DLLTC) report. Alliance for a Better Community.

August, D., & Hakuta, K. (1997). *Improving schooling for language-minority children*. National Academy Press.

Axelrod, Y. (2014). "Todos vamos a jugar, even the teachers"—Everyone playing together. *Young Children, 69*(2), 24-31.

Axelrod, Y., & Cole, M. W. (2018). 'The pumpkins are coming… vienen las calabazas… that sounds funny': Translanguaging practices of young emergent bilinguals. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy, 18*(1), 129-153.

Baecher, L., Knoll, M., & Patti, J. (2013). Addressing English language learners in the school leadership curriculum: Mapping the terrain. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education, 8*(3), 280-303.

Baglieri, S., Bejoian, L. M., Broderick, A. A., Connor, D. J., & Valle, J. (2011). [Re]claiming "inclusive education" toward cohesion in educational reform: Disability studies unravels the myth of the normal child. *Teachers College Record, 113*(10), 2122-2154.

Baird, A. S. (2015, May 18). *Dual language learners reader post #2: Who are dual language learners?* New America Foundation.

Baker, K. (1998). Structured English immersion: Breakthrough in teaching limited-English-proficient students. *Phi Delta Kappan, 80*(3), 199-204.

Baker, K. A., & de Kanter, A. A. (1983). *Bilingual education: A reappraisal of federal policy.* Lexington, MA: Heath.

Ballantyne, K. G., Sanderman, A. R., & Levy, J. (2008). *Educating English language learners: Building teacher capacity.* Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition.

Bauer, L. & Schanzenbach, D. W. (2016). The long-term impact of the Head Start Program. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Belfield, C. R., Nores, M., Barnett, S., & Schweinhart, L. (2006). The High/Scope Perry preschool program cost-benefit analysis using data from the age-40 follow-up. *Journal of Human Resources, 41*(1), 162-190.

Bengochea, A., Sembiante, S. F., & Gort, M. (2018). An emergent bilingual child's multimodal choices in sociodramatic play. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy, 18*(1), 38-70.

Berardino, M. (2015). *Latinos in Massachusetts public schools: Boston*. University of Massachusetts Boston: Gaston Institute Publications.

Berk, L. E., & Winsler, A. (1995). *Scaffolding children's learning: Vygotsky and early childhood education.* Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Bernhard, J. K., & Pacini-Ketchabaw, V. (2010). The politics of language and educational practices: Promoting truly diverse child care settings. In B. Spodeck and O. Saracho (Eds.). *Contemporary perspectives in early childhood education: Language and cultural diversity in early childhood education*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Bialystok, E. (2007). Acquisition of literacy in bilingual children: A framework for research. *Language Learning, 57*(1), 45-77.

Bialystok, E., Barac, R., Blaye, A., & Poulin-Dubois, D. (2010). Word mapping and executive functioning in young monolingual and bilingual children. *Journal of Cognition and Development, 11*, 485-508.

Bialystok, E., Peets, K., & Moreno, S. (2014). Producing bilinguals through immersion education: Development of metalinguistic awareness. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 35*(1), 177-191.

Bloom, H. S., & Weiland, C. (2015). *Quantifying variation in Head Start effects on young children's cognitive and socio-emotional skills using data from the National Head Start Impact Study.* New York, NY: MDRC

Bodrova, E., & Leong, D. J. (2005). High quality preschool programs: What would Vygotsky say? *Early Education and Development, 16*(4), 438-446.

Bodrova, E., & Leong, D. J. (2007). *Tools of the mind: The Vygotskian approach to early childhood education (2nd ed)*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bodur, Y. (2012). Impact of course and fieldwork on multicultural beliefs and attitudes. *The Educational Forum, 76*, 41-56.

Boston Globe Editorial Board. (2015, March 31). Boston needs legislative fix to aid English-language learners. *Boston Globe.* https://www.bostonglobe.com/opinion/editorials/2015/03/30/boston-needs-legislative-fix-aid-english-language-learners/V9jePOwBfSwFepEkmoKqiK/story.html

Boston Indicators. (2017). *Boston's foreign born population, a breakdown*. The Boston Foundation. https://www.bostonindicators.org/article-pages/2017/april/boston-foreign-born

Boston Planning & Development Agency. (2018, September). *Boston by the numbers 2018*. http://www.bostonplans.org/getattachment/3e8bfacf-27c1-4b55-adee-29c5d79f4a38

Boston Pubic Schools, Office of Data and Accountability. (2014, January). *Measuring the effectiveness of BPS K1 programs using Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS): Fall 2013 assessment (beginning of year)—grade K2*. https://www.bostonpublicschools.org/cms/lib07/MA01906464/Centricity/domain/238/other%20academic%20reports/DIBELSAnalysisBOY2013_FINAL_FINAL.pdf

Boston Redevelopment Authority. (2015). *Boston in context: Neighborhoods*. http://www.bostonplans.org/research/research-publications-overview/neighborhoods

Bouchillon, E. (n.d.). *Dynamic assessment: Definition, process & examples*. http://study.com/academy/lesson/dynamic-assessment-definition-process-examples.html

Bowman, B. T. (2006). Standards at the heart of educational equity. *Young Children, 61*(5), 42-48.

Bowman, B. T., Donovan, M. S., & Burns, M. S. (Eds.). (2001). *Eager to earn: Educating our preschoolers.* National Research Council. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Brown, Z. A., & DiRanna, K. (2012). *Equal access to content instruction for English learners: An example from science*. Region IX Equity Assistance Center at WestEd. http://www.wested.org/wp-content/files_mf/1372286186EqualAccessforEnglishLearners10.pdf

Bruner, C. (2007). *Foreword: The need for a multicultural approach to early learning standards.* The Build Initiative Diversity and School Readiness Summit. http://www.build.org

Buysse, V., Castro, D. C., West, T. & Skinner, M. L. (2004). *Addressing the needs of Latino children: A national survey of state administrators of early childhood programs.* Executive Summary. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina, FPG Child Development Institute.

Buysse, V., Castro, D. C., West, T., & Skinner, M. (2005). Addressing the needs of Latino children: A national survey of state administrators of early childhood programs. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 20,* 146-163.

Capps, R., Fix, M., Ost, J., Reardon-Anderson, J., & Passel, J. S. (2005). *The health and well-being of young children of immigrants.* Urban Institute. http://www.urban.org/research/publication/health-and-well-being-young-children-immigrants

Carlisle, J. F., Beeman, M., Davis, L. H., & Spharim, G. (1999). Relationship of metalinguistic capabilities and reading achievement for children who are becoming bilingual. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 20*, 459-478.

Carneiro, P., & Ginja, R. (2014). Long-term impacts of compensatory preschool on health and behavior: Evidence from Head Start. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy, 6*(4), 135-173.

Castro, D. C., Espinosa, L. M., & Páez, M. M. (2011). Defining and measuring quality in early childhood practices that promote dual language learners' development and learning. In M. Zaslow, I. Martinez-Beck, K. Tout, & T. Halle (Eds.), *Quality measurement in early childhood settings* (pp. 257-280). Brookes.

Castro, D. C., Páez, M. M., Dickinson, D. K., & Frede, E. (2011). Promoting language and literacy in young dual language learners: Research, practice, and policy. *Child Development Perspectives, 5*(1), 15-21.

Cervantes-Soon, C. G. (2014). A critical look at dual language immersion in the new Latin@ diaspora. *Bilingual Research Journal, 37*(1), 64-82.

Chen, X., & French, D. (2008). Children's social competence in cultural context. *Annual Review of Psychology, 59*, 591-616.

Child Care Bureau, Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (n.d.). *A guide to Good Start, Grow Smart in child care*. http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED499401.pdf

Child Trends. (2019). *Dual Language Learners*. https://www.childtrends.org/indicators/dual-language-learners

Cioè-Peña, M. (2020). Raciolinguistics and the education of emergent bilinguals labeled as disabled. *The Urban Review*. doi:10.1007/s11256-020-00581-z

Collinson, V., Killeavy, M., & Stephenson, H. J. (1998). *Exemplary teachers: Practicing an ethic of care in England, Ireland, and the United States.* Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. San Diego, CA: AERA.

Cook, S., & Bornfreund, L. (2015, November). *Starting young: Massachusetts birth-3rd grade policies that support children's literacy development.* New America Foundation. https://static.newamerica.org/attachments/11901-starting-young/StartingYoung11.13.3ebe6fdcefde4d86b28717e2399119af.pdf

Crawford, J. (1992). *Hold your tongue: Bilingualism and the politics of "English only."* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Crawford, J., & Krashen, S. (2007). *English learners in American classrooms: 101 questions, 101 answers.* New York: Scholastic.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Ltd.

Crosnoe, R. (2007). Early child care and the school readiness of children from Mexican immigrant families. *International Migration Review, 41*(1), 152-181.

Cummins, J. (1979). Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children. *Review of Educational Research, 49*(2), 222-251.

Cummins, J. (1984). *Bilingualism and special education: Issues in assessment and pedagogy*. Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.

Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Daniel, J., & Friedman, S. (2005, November). *Taking the next step: Preparing teachers to work with culturally and linguistically diverse children*. Beyond the Journal: Young Children on the Web. The National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Danoff, M. N. (1978). *Evaluation of the impact of ESEA Title VII Spanish/English bilingual education programs: Overview of study and findings.* Palo Alto: American Institutes for Research.

De La Torre, M. A. (2009). *The problem with the melting pot*. Ethics Daily. http://www.ethicsdaily.com/the-problem-with-the-melting-pot-cms-13647

DeBruin-Parecki, A., & Slutzky, C. (2016). *Exploring pre-k age 4 learning standards and their role in early childhood education: Research and policy implications*. Princeton, New Jersey: Education Testing Service.

Delpit, L. (2012). *"Multiplication is for White people": Raising the expectations for other people's children.* New Press.

Diez, V., & Karp, F. (2013). *Two-way bilingual education in Boston Public Schools: Required features, guidelines, and recommendations*. University of Massachusetts Boston: Gaston Institute Publications.

Dixon, L. Q., Zhao, J., Shin, J., Wu, S., Su, J., Burgess-Brigham, R., Gezer, M. U., & Snow, C. (2012). What we know about second language acquisition: A synthesis from four perspectives. *Review of Educational Research, 82*(1), 5-60.

Drew, W. F., Christie, J., Johnson, J. E., Meckley, A. M., Nell, M. L., Chalufour, I. (2008). Constructive play: A value-added strategy for meeting early learning standards. *Young Children, 63*(4), 38-44.

Eberly, J. L., Rand, M. K., & O'Connor, T. (2007). Analyzing teachers' dispositions towards diversity: Using adult development theory. *Multicultural Education, 14*(4), 31-36.

Edl, H. M., Jones, M. H., & Estell, D. B. (2008). Ethnicity and English proficiency: Teacher perceptions of academic and interpersonal competence in European American and Latino students. *School Psychology Review, 37*, 38-45.

Education Commission of the States. (2014, November). *How is an 'English language learner' defined in state policy?* http://ecs.force.com/mbdata/mbquestNB2?rep=ELL1402

Edwards, C. P. (2000). Children's play in cross-cultural perspective: A new look at the Six Culture Study. *Cross-Cult. Res. 34*, 318-338.

Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Building theories from case study research. *Academy of Management, 14*(4), 532-550.

Espinosa, L. M. (2007). English-language learners as they enter school. In R. C. Pianta, M. J. Cox & K. L. Snow (Eds.), *Accountability* (pp. 175-196). Baltimore, MD: Paul H Brookes.

Espinosa, L. (2013). *Early education for dual language learners: Promoting school readiness and early school success.* Migration Policy Institute. http://www.migrationpolicy.org

Espinosa, L. M., & Calderón, M. (2015*). State early learning and development standards, policies and related practices: How responsive are they to the needs of young dual language learners?* Build Initiative. http://www.buildinitiative.org

Espinosa, L. M., & García, E. E. (2012). *Working paper #1: Developmental assessment of young dual language learners with a focus on kindergarten entry assessment: Implications for state policies*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina, FPG Child Development Institute, Center for Early Care and Education Research-Dual Language Learners.

Espinosa, L. M., & López, M. L. (2007). *Assessment considerations for young English language learners across different levels of accountability*. Prepared for the National Early Childhood Accountability Task Force and First 5 LA. http://www.pewtrusts.org

Fan, S. P., Liberman, Z., Keysar, B., & Kinzler, K. D. (2015). The exposure advantage: Early exposure to a multilingual environment promotes effective communication. *Psychological Science, 26*(7), 1-8.

Fenner, D. S., & Segota, J. (2012). *Standards that impact English Language Learners.* Colorín colorado.

Fichtenbaum, R. (2004). *Contextual aspects of the passage of Question 2 in Massachusetts: A language policy and planning analysis.* https://www.swarthmore.edu/sites/default/files/assets/documents/linguistics/2004_fichtenbaum_rachel.pdf

Figueras-Daniel, A., & Barnett, W.S. (2013). *Preparing young Hispanic dual language learners for a knowledge economy.* New Brunswick, N.J: National Institute for Early Education Research.

Fleer, M., Anning, A., & Cullen, J. (2009). A framework for conceptualizing early childhood education. In A. Anning, J. Cullen & M. Fleer (Eds.), *Early childhood education: Society and culture, 2nd edition* (pp. 175-189). London: Sage Publications.

Fletcher, T. V., Bos, C. S., & Johnson, L. M. (1999). Accommodating English language learners with language and learning disabilities in bilingual education classrooms. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 14*, 80-91.

Flores, B. B., & Smith, H. L. (2008). Teachers' characteristics and attitudinal beliefs about linguistic and cultural diversity. *Bilingual Research Journal, 31*, 323-358.

Flores, N. L. (2019). Translanguaging into raciolinguistic ideologies: A personal reflection on the legacy of Ofelia García. *Journal of Multilingual Education Research, 9*(5), 45-60.

Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review, 85*(2), 149-171.

Flores, R. L., Curby, T. W., Coleman, H., & Melo, K. (2016). Using early learning standards to provide high-quality education for all children: The early learning guidelines toolkit. *Theory into Practice, 55*(2), 145-152.

Fortuny, K., Hernandez, D. J., & Chaudry, A. (2010, August). Young children of immigrants: The leading edge of America's future. *The Urban Institute, 3*, 1-13.

Framingham Source. (2016, July 8). *Massachusetts senate passes bill to expand language opportunities for students.* Framingham Source. http://www.framinghamsource.com/index.php/2016/07/08/massachusetts-senate-passes-bill-expand-language-opportunities-students/

Freedberg, L., Frey, S., & Tully, S. (2016). *Promoting success for dual language learners: The essential role of early childhood education programs.* EdSource Report. https://edsource.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Promoting-Success-For-Dual-Language_Learners-2016.pdf

Galindo, C. (2010). English language learners' math and reading achievement trajectories in the elementary grades. In E. E. García & E. C. Frede (Eds.), *Young English language learners: Current research and emerging directions for practice and policy* (pp. 42-58). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Galvez, L. (2013). *The No Child Left Behind Act leaves behind ESL children*. http://www.luc.edu/media/lucedu/law/centers/childlaw/childed/pdfs/2013studentpapers/galvez.pdf

Gándara, P., & Maxwell-Jolly, J. (2006). Critical issues in developing the teacher corps for English learners. In K. Tellez & H.C. Waxman (Eds.), *Preparing quality educators for English language learners: Research, policies, and practices* (pp. 99-120). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Gándara, P., Maxwell-Jolly, J., & Driscoll, A. (2005). *Listening to teachers of English language learners: A survey of California teachers' challenges, experiences, and professional development needs*. Santa Cruz, CA: The Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning.

García, E. E. (2004). Bilingualism is not the arithmetic sum of two languages. In O. N. Saracho & B. Spodek (Eds.), *Contemporary perspectives on language policy and literacy instruction in early childhood education* (pp. 243-258). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

García, E. E., & Gonzales, D. M. (2006, July). *PreK and Latinos: The foundation for America's future.* Pre-K Now. http://www.preknow.org

García, O. (2009). Emergent bilinguals and TESOL: What's in a name? *TESOL Quarterly, 43*(2), 322-326.

García, O. (2009). Racializing the language practices of U.S. Latinos: Impact on their education. In J. Cobas, J. Feagin, & J. Duany (Eds.), *How the United States Racializes Latinos: White hegemony and its consequences* (pp. 101-115). Paradigm Publisher.

García, O., & Beardsmore, H. B. (2008). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

García, O., & Kleifgen, J. (2010). *Educating emergent bilinguals: Policies, programs, and practices for English language learners.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

García, O., Kleifgen, J., & Falchi, L. (2008). *From English language learners to emergent bilinguals: A research initiative of the Campaign for Educational Equity*. New York: Teachers College Press.

García, O., & Torres-Guevara, R. (2010). Monoglossic ideologies and language policies in the education of U.S. Latinas/os. In Murillo, E., Villenas, S., Galván, R. T., Muñoz, J. S., Martínez, C., & Machado-Casas, M. (Eds.). *Handbook of Latinos and Education: Research, theory and practice.* Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum, pp. 182-194.

García, O., & Walqui, A. (2015). What do educators need to know about language as they make decisions about common core state standards implementation? In G. Valdés, K. Menken, & M. Castro (Eds.), *Common core bilingual and English language learners: A resource for educators* (pp. 47-50). Philadelphia: Caslon Publishing.

García, O., & Wei, Li. (2015). Translanguaging, bilingualism and bilingual education. In W. Wright, S. Boun, & O. García (Eds.), *Handbook of bilingual education* (pp. 223-240). Malden, MA: John Wiley.

Garton, A. F. (2007). Learning through collaboration: Is there a multicultural perspective? In F. Salili & R. Hoosain (Eds.), *Culture, motivation, and learning: A multicultural perspective* (pp. 195-215). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Genishi, C. (1981). Language across the contexts of early childhood. *Theory Into Practice, 20*(2), 109-115.

Genishi, C., & Dyson, A.H. (2012). Racing to the top: Who's accounting for the children? *Bank Street Occasional Papers, 27*, 18-20.

Gesell, A. (1925). *The mental growth of the pre-school child: A psychological outline of normal development from birth to the sixth year, including a system of developmental diagnosis.* MacMillan Co.

Gesell, A. (1946). The ontogenesis of infant behavior. In L. Carmichael (Ed.), *Manual of child psychology* (pp. 295-331). New York, NY: Wiley.

Goldenberg, C. (2008). Teaching English Language Learners: What the research does— and does not say. *American Educator*, 8-44. Washington, DC.

Goldenberg, C. (2010). Reading instruction for English language learners. In M. Kamil, P. D. Pearson, E. Moje, & P. Afflerbach (Eds.). *Handbook of Reading Research, 4*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Goldenberg, C. (2013). Unlocking the research on English learners: What we know—and don't yet know—about effective instruction. *American Educator, 37*(2), 4-11.

Goldenberg, C., Hicks, J., & Lit, I. (2013). Dual language learners: Effective instruction in early childhood. *American Educator, 37*(2), 26-29.

Goodwin, A., Cheruvu, R., & Genishi, C. (2008). Responding to multiple diversities in early childhood education: How far have we come? *Diversities in early childhood: Rethinking and doing.* 3-10.

Gormley, W. (2008). The effects of Oklahoma's pre-kindergarten program on Hispanic children. *Social Science Quarterly, 89*, 916-936.

Gort, M. (2012). Code-switching patterns in the writing-related talk of young emergent bilinguals. *Journal of Literacy Research, 44*(1), 45-75.

Gort, M., Pontier, R. W., & Sembiante, S. F. (2012). Function, type, and distribution of teacher questions in dual-language preschool read alouds. *Bilingual Research Journal, 35*(3), 258-276.

Gort, M., & Sembiante, S. F. (2015). Navigating hybridized language learning spaces through translanguaging pedagogy: Dual language preschool teachers' languaging practices in support of emergent bilingual children's performance of academic discourse. *International Multilingual Research Journal, 9*(1), 7-25.

Gottfried, M. A., & Kim, H. Y. (2015). *Improving school readiness: Formal versus informal pre-kindergarten and children in immigrant families*. Bacon Public Lectureship & White Paper. University of California, Santa Barbara.

Greene, J. (1997). A meta-analysis of the Rossell and Baker review of bilingual education research. *Bilingual Research Journal, 21,* 103-122.

Grisham-Brown, J., Hallam, R., & Brookshire, R. (2006). Using authentic assessment to evidence children's progress toward early learning standards. *Early Childhood Education Journal, 34*(1), 45-51.

Grooms, A. M. (2011). *Bilingual education in the United States: An analysis of the convergence of policy, theory and research* (Doctoral dissertation).

Grossman, S. (2008). *The worksheet dilemma: Benefits of play-based curricula*. Earlychildhood NEWS.

Gutiérrez, K. D., Asato, J., Pacheco, M., Moll, L. C., Olson, K., Horng, E. L., Ruiz, R., García, E., & McCarty, T. L. (2002). "Sounding American": The consequences of new reforms on English language learners. *Reading Research Quarterly, 37*(3), 328-343.

Guzman-Orth, D., López, A. A., & Tolentino, F. (2017). *A framework for the dual language assessment of young dual language learners in the United States*. ETS Research Report Series. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/ets2.12165

Haberman, M. (1991). Pedagogy of poverty versus good teaching. *Phi Delta Kappan, 73*, 290-294.

Hakuta, K., & Mostafapour, E. F. (1996). Perspectives from the history and politics of bilingualism and bilingual education in the United States. In I. Parasnis (Ed.), *Cultural and language diversity: Reflections on the deaf experience* (pp. 38-50). New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Halle, T., Forry, N., Hair, E., Perper, K., Wandner, L., Wessel, J., & Vick, J. (2009, June). *Disparities in early learning and development: Lessons from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study—Birth Cohort (ECLS-B).* Child Trends. http://www.childtrends.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/2009-52DisparitiesELExecSumm.pdf

Hammer, C. S., Hoff, E., Uchikoshi, Y., Gillanders, C., Castro, D., & Sandilos, L. E. (2014). The Language and Literacy Development of Young Dual Language Learners: A Critical Review. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *29*(4), 715-733. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2014.05.008

Han, W. J., & Huang, C. C. (2010). The forgotten treasure: Bilingualism and Asian children's emotional and behavioral health. *American Journal of Public Health, 100*(5), 831-838.

Hatch, J. A. (2002). Accountability shovedown: Resisting the standards movement in early childhood education. *The Phi Delta Kappan, 83*(6), 457-462.

Heckman, J. J. (2006). Skill formation and the economics of investing in disadvantaged children. *Science, 312*(5782), 1900-1902.

Heckman, J. J., & Masterov, D. V. (2007). The productivity argument for investing in young children. *Review of Agricultural Economics, 29*(3), 446-493.

Heckman, J. J., Moon, S. H., Pinto, R., Savelyev, P. A., & Yavitz, A. Q. (2010). The rate of return to the HighScope Perry preschool program. *Journal of Public Economics, 94*(1-2), 114-128.

Helfrich, S. R., & Bean, R. M. (2011). Beginning teachers reflect on their experiences being prepared to teach literacy. *Teacher Education and Practice,* 24(2), 201-222.

Hellinger, M., & Pauwels, A. (Eds.). (2007). *Language and communication: Diversity and change.* Berlin: Mouton-De Gruyter.

Hill, J. D., & Flynn, K. (2004). English Language Learner Resource Guide: A Guide for Rural Districts with a Low Incidence of ELLs. *Mid Continent Research for Education and Learning*.

Hochschild, J. (2009). Conducting intensive interviews and elite interviews. In M. Lamont & P. White (Eds.), *Workshop on interdisciplinary standards for systematic qualitative research* (pp. 124-128). Washington, DC: National Science Foundation.

Hollins, E., & Guzman, M. T. (2005). Research on preparing teachers for diverse populations. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. M. Zeichner (Eds.), *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education* (pp. 477-548). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Horn, C. (2003). High-stakes testing and students: Stopping or perpetuating a cycle of failure? *Theory into Practice, 42*(1), 30-41.

Horwitz, R. A., Uro, G., Price-Baugh, R., Simon, C., Uzzell, R., Lewis, S., & Casserly, M. (2009). *Succeeding with English language learners: Lessons learned from the Great City Schools*. Washington, DC: Council of the Great City Schools.

Hyson, M. (2008). *Enthusiastic and engaged learners: Approaches to learning in the early childhood classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Isik-Ercan, Z., & Golbeck, S. (2010). *Guided participation*. The Gale Group: Cengage Learning. http://www.education.com/reference/article/guided-participation/

Jimenez-Castellanos, O., Combs, M. C., Martínez, D., & Gómez, L. (2013). *English language learners: What's at stake for Arizona?* Morrison Institute for Public Policy. Tempe: Arizona State University.

Kagan, S. L. (2008). *American early childhood education: Preventing or perpetuating inequity?* Working Draft. 2008 Equity Symposium, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Kagan, S. L. (2012). Early learning and development standards: An elixir for early childhood systems reform. In S. L. Kagan & K. Kauerz, (Eds.), *Early childhood systems: Transforming early learning* (pp. 55-70). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Kagan, S. L., Britto, P. R., & Engle, P. (2005). Early Learning Standards: What can America learn? What can America teach? *Phi Delta Kappan, 87*(3), 205-208.

Kagan, S. L., & Hallmark, L. G. (2002). The pendulum of early childhood curriculum: A story of changing contexts and ideologies. In. V. Sollars (Ed.), *Curricula, policies, and practices in early childhood education* (pp. 14-22). Malta: P.E.G. Ltd.

Kagan, S. L., Moore, E., & Bredekamp, S. (1995). *Reconsidering children's early development and learning: Toward common views and vocabulary*. National Education Goals Panel, Goal 1 Technical Planning Group. Washington, DC.

Kagan, S. L., Reid, J. L., & Scott-Little, C. (2013). *Massachusetts Department of Education early education and care alignment study. Deliverable V: Summary of findings and recommendations.* http://www.mass.gov/edu/docs/eec/2014/20140306-alignment-mapping-project.pdf

Kagan, S. L., & Scott-Little, C. (2004). Early learning standards: Changing the parlance and practice of early childhood education. *Phi Delta Kappan, 85*, 388-396.

Kagan, S. L., Scott-Little, C., & Frelow, V. S. (2003). Early learning standards for young children: A survey of the states. *Young Children, 58*(5), 58-64.

Kagan, S. L., & Tarrant, K. (2010). *Transitions for young children: Creating connections across early childhood systems*. Baltimore, MD: Brookes.

Karasik, L. B., Adolph, K. E., Tamis-LeMonda, C. S., & Bornstein, M. H. (2010). WEIRD walking: Cross-cultural research on motor development. *Behavioral Brain Sciences, 33*(2-3), 95-96.

Karasik, L. B., Tamis-LeMonda, C. S., Adolph, K. E., & Bornstein, M. H. (2015). Places and postures: A cross-cultural comparison of sitting in 5-month-olds. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 46*(8), 1023-1038.

Karoly, L. A., & Gonzalez, G. C. (2011, Spring). Early care and education for children in immigrant families. *The Future of Children, 21*(1), 71-101.

Katz, L., Inan, H. Z., Tyson, C., Dixson, A., & Kang, H. (2010). Professional development for the early learning content social studies standards. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education, 2*(2), 261-285.

Kendziora, K., Weissberg, R. P., Ji, P., & Dusenbury, L. A. (2011). *Strategies for social and emotional learning: Preschool and elementary grade student learning standards and assessment.* Newton, MA: National Center for Mental Health Promotion and Youth Violence Prevention, Education Development Center, Inc.

Kieffer, M. J., Lesaux, N. K., Rivera, M., & Francis, D. J. (2009, September). Accommodations for English Language Learners taking large-scale assessments: A meta-analysis on effectiveness and validity. *Review of Educational Research, 79*(3), 1168-1201.

Kloss, H. (1998). *The American bilingual tradition*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems (Original Publication, 1977).

Ladson-Billings, G. (2001). *Crossing over to Canaan: The journey of new teachers in diverse classrooms*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2006). From the achievement gap to the education debt: Understanding achievement in U.S. schools. *Educational Researcher, 35*(7), 3-12.

Landers, C. (2011). *Equity in education: The promise of early learning*. Working draft for discussion. UNICEF, New York.

Laosa, L. M., & Ainsworth, P. (2007). *Is public pre-k preparing Hispanic children to succeed in school?* New Brunswick, NJ: National Institute for Early Education Research.

Larsen-Freedman, D., & Goldenberg, C. (2015). What do we know about second language acquisition in instructional settings? In G. Valdés, K. Menken, & M. Castro (Eds.), *Common core bilingual and English language learners: A resource for educators* (pp. 65-69). Philadelphia: Caslon Publishing.

Larsen-Freeman, D., Snow, C., & Kibler, A. (2015). How has the acquisition/development of English been conceptualized for English language learners/emergent bilinguals? What are implications of different ways of conceptualizing these processes? In G. Valdés, K. Menken, & M. Castro (Eds.), *Common core bilingual and English language learners: A resource for educators* (pp. 42-46). Philadelphia: Caslon Publishing.

Lee, T. (2011). I did it all by myself: Scaffolding to develop problem-solving and self-help skills in young children. *Texas Child Care Quarterly, 34*(4), 38-42.

Leithwood, K., Louis, K., Anderson, S., Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning*. New York, NY: The Wallace Foundation.

Lidz, C. S., & Gindis, B. (2003). Dynamic assessment of the evolving cognitive functions in children. In A. Kozulin, B. Gindis, V. S. Ageyev, & S. M. Miller (Eds.), *Vygotsky's educational theory in cultural context* (pp. 99-118). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lindholm-Leary, K. (2001). *Dual language education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Luchtel, M., Hughes, K., Luze, G., Richardson Bruna, K., & Peterson, C. (2010). A comparison of teacher-rated classroom conduct, social skills, and teacher-child relationship quality between preschool English learners and preschool English speakers. *NHSA Dialog: A Research-to-Practice Journal for the Early Intervention Field, 13*(2), 92-111.

Luo, R., Tamis-LeMonda, C. S., & Song, L. (2013). Chinese parents' goals and practices in early childhood. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 28*, 843-857.

Magnuson, K., Lahaie, C., & Waldfogel, J. (2006). Preschool and school readiness of children of immigrants. *Social Science Quarterly, 87*, 1241-1262.

Magruder, E. S., Hayslip, W. W., Espinosa, L. M., & Matera, C. (2013, March). Many languages, one teacher: Supporting language and literacy development for preschool dual language learners. National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC). *Young Children*, 8-15.

Malakoff, M., & Hakuta, K. (1990). History of minority education in the United States. In A. Padilla, C. Valdez, & H. Fairchild (Eds.), *Bilingual education: Issues and strategies* (pp. 27-43). Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications.

Massachusetts Association for Bilingual Education (MABE). (n.d.). *Federal and state laws and regulations in the education of English language learners*. http://www.massmabe.org

Massachusetts Association of Teachers of Speakers of Other Languages (MATSOL). (2009). *English Language Learners in Massachusetts (ELLs) factsheet.* MATSOL.

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2009, December). *Halting the race to the bottom: Urgent interventions for the improvement of the education of English Language Learners in Massachusetts and selected districts*. http://www.matsol.org/assets/documents/2009_HaltingRace_Full%5B1%5D.pdf

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2017). *MCAS achievement results.* http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/statereport/mcas.aspx

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2017). *Student assessment—ACCESS for ELLs results—ACCESS for ELLs statewide results.* http://www.doe.mass.edu/mcas/access/results.html

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2019). *The Massachusetts model system for educator evaluation: Classroom teacher rubric*. http://www.doe.mass.edu/edeval/model/

Massachusetts Language Opportunity Coalition. (n.d.). *Fact sheet: An act relative to Language Opportunity for our Kids (LOOK) H.498/S.262.* www.languageOpportunity.org

Massachusetts Language Opportunity Coalition. (2017, May). *English learner education bills: H.3705/S.2070 an act for language opportunity for our kids.* https://languageopportunity.files.wordpress.com/2015/01/look_bill_fact_sheet_may2017.pdf

Massachusetts Language Opportunity Coalition. (2017). *Coalition celebrates a victory for students across Massachusetts.* https://languageopportunity.org/2017/11/15/coalition-celebrates-a-victory-for-students-across-mass/

Matthews, H. (2011). *Meeting the early learning challenge: Supporting English language learners.* Center for Law and Social Policy, Inc. (CLASP).

Maxwell, J. A. (2005). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach (2nd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Maxwell, K. L., Lim, C-I., & Early, D. M. (2006). *Early childhood teacher preparation programs in the United States: National report*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina, FPG Child Development Institute.

McDonald, N., Schoenebeck, S., & Forte, A. (2019). Reliability and inter-rater reliability in qualitative research: Norms and guidelines for CSCW and HCI practice. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction, 3*(72), 1-23.

McGuiggan, R. L., Lee, G., Spanjaard, D., Denize, S. M., Sharma, N. (2008). *Cross-case analysis: An alternative methodology.* Marketing: Shifting the focus from mainstream to offbeat: Proceedings of the Australian and New Zealand marketing academy conference, held 1-3 December 2008, Olympic Park, Sydney, N.S.W.

McHatton, P. A., & Correa, V. (2005). Stigma and discrimination: Perspectives from Mexican and Puerto Rican mothers of children with special needs. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 25*(3), 131-142.

McLaughlin, B. (1984). *Second language acquisition in childhood: Preschool children*. Vol. 1. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.

McNamara, K. (2016, September). *Dual language learners in Head Start: The promises and pitfalls of new forms.* Migration Policy Institute. https://www.migrationpolicy.org/print/15693#.WlZCLVQ-fv0

Mendez, L. I., Crais, E. R., Castro, D. C., & Kainz, K. (2015). A culturally and linguistically responsive vocabulary approach for young Latino dual language learners. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research, 58*, 93-106.

Menken, K. (2008). *English learners left behind: Standardized testing as language policy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Menken, K., & Solorza, C. (2014). No Child Left Bilingual: Accountability and the elimination of bilingual education programs in New York City schools. *Educational Policy, 28*(1), 96-125.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Miller, M., Strosnider, R., & Dooley, E. (2002). States' diversity requirements for teachers. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 25*(1), 32-40.

Mitchell, C. (2015, March 30). *Boston schools shortchanging English-language learners, federal review finds*. Learning the Language blog, Education Week.

Mitchell, C. (2016, December 7). *Majority of English learner students are born in the United States, analysis finds*. Learning the Language Blog, Education Week.

Moll, L. C. (2013). *L. S. Vygotsky and education*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Mongeau, L. (2016, August). What Boston's preschools get right. *The Atlantic*. http://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2016/08/what-bostons-preschools-get-right/493952/

Morris, P., Raver, C., Lloyd, C. M., & Millenky, M. (2009). *Can teacher training in classroom management make a difference for children's experiences in preschool? A preview of findings from the Foundations of Learning Demonstration*. MDRC.

Mowder, B. A., Rubinson, F., & Yasik, A. E. (Eds.). (2009). *Evidence-based practice in infant and early childhood psychology.* Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.

Muschkin, C. G., Ladd, H. F., & Dodge, K. A. (2015). *Impact of North Carolina's early childhood initiatives on special education placements in third grade*. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis. doi:10.3102/0162373714559096

National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC). (1995). *Position statement: Responding to linguistic and cultural diversity: Recommendations for effective early childhood education*. www.naeyc.org/about/positions/pdf/PSDIV98.pdf

National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC). (2002, November). *Early learning standards: Creating the conditions for success*. A joint position statement of NAEYC and the National Association of Early Childhood Specialists in State Departments of Education (NAECS/SDE). https://www.naeyc.org/files/naeyc/file/positions/position_statement.pdf

National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC). (2009). *Position statement: Developmentally appropriate practice in early childhood programs serving children from birth through age 8*. https://www.naeyc.org/sites/default/files/globally-shared/downloads/PDFs/resources/position-statements/PSDAP.pdf

National Center for Culturally Responsive Educational Systems. (2004). *Disproportionate representation of culturally and linguistically diverse students in special education: Measuring the problem*. http://www.colorincolorado.org/article/disproportionate-representation-culturally-and-linguistically-diverse-students-special

National Conference of State Legislatures. (2018). *Dual-and English-language learners.* http://www.ncsl.org/research/education/english-dual-language-learners.aspx

National Council of Teachers of English. (2008). *English language learners: A policy research brief produced by the National Council of Teachers of English*. http://www.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Resources/PolicyResearch/ELLResearchBrief.pdf

National Institute for Early Education Research (NIEER). (2014, November 13). *Young immigrants and dual language learners: Participation in pre-k & gaps at kindergarten entry*. http://nieer.org/2015/02/18/young-immigrants-and-dual-language-learners-participation-in-pre-k-and-kindergarten-entry-gaps

National Institute for Early Education Research (NIEER). (2015). *Special report: Dual language learners and preschool workforce.* Rutgers Graduate School of Education: The National Institute for Early Education Research. http://nieer.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/2015_DLL_and_Workforce_rev1.pdf

National Institute for Early Education Research (NIEER). (2015). *The state of preschool 2015: State preschool yearbook.* Rutgers Graduate School of Education: The National Institute for Early Education Research. http://nieer.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Massachusetts_2015_rev1.pdf

National Institute for Early Education Research (NIEER). (2017). *Special report: Supporting dual language learners in state-funded preschool.* Rutgers Graduate School of Education: The National Institute for Early Education Research. http://nieer.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/YB2017_DLL-Special-Report.pdf

National Research Council. (1997). *Improving student learning in mathematics and science: The role of national standards in state policy*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

Neuman, S. B., & Roskos, K. (2005). The state of state pre-kindergarten standards. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 20*, 125-145.

Noormohamadi, R. (2008). Mother tongue, a necessary step to intellectual development. *Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics, 12*(2), 25-36.

Office of Head Start. (2009). *OHS definition of dual language learners*. https://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/hslc/tta-system/cultural-linguistic/Dual%20Language%20Learners/DLL_%20https://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/pdf/report-congress-dual-language-learners.pdf#page=23

Ortiz, S. O. (2012, May 4). *Testing with culturally and linguistically diverse students: Moving beyond traditional habits to evidence-based practices*. UW-La Crosse 34th Annual School Psychology Roundtable. http://facpub.stjohns.edu/~flanagad/cross-battery/downloads/UW-LaCrosse%20-%20School%20Psych%20Roundtable%202012%20-%20Ortiz.pdf

Otto, H., Potinius, I., & Keller, H. (2014). Cultural differences in stranger-child interactions: A comparison between German middle-class and Cameroonian Nso stranger-infant dyads. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology, 45*(2), 322-334.

Ovando, C. J. (2003). Bilingual education in the United States: Historical development and current issues. *Bilingual Research Journal, 27*(1), 1-24.

Owens, A. (2010). *In the aftermath of Question 2: Students with limited English proficiency in Massachusetts.* Boston: Massachusetts Office for Refugees and Immigrants.

Pacini-Ketchabaw, V., & Armstrong de Almeida, A. (2006). Language discourses and ideologies at the heart of early childhood education. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 9*(3), 310-341.

Paris, D. (2012). Culturally sustaining pedagogy: A needed change in stance, terminology, and practice. *Educational Researcher, 41*(3), 93-97.

Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (2017). *Culturally sustaining pedagogies: Teaching and learning for justice in a changing world.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Peal, E., & Lambert, W. E. (1962). The relation of bilingualism to intelligence. *Psychological Monograph*, *76*(546), 1-23.

Penn, H. (2011). *Quality in early childhood services: An international perspective*. Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press/McGraw-Hill Education.

Pettito, L. A., & Kovelman, I. (2003). The bilingual paradox: How signing-speaking bilingual children help us resolve bilingual issues and teach us about the brain's mechanisms underlying all language acquisition. *Learning Languages, 8*(3), 5-18.

Porter, R. P. (1990). *Forked tongue: The politics of bilingual education*. New York: Basic Books.

Porter, R. P. (1998). The case against bilingual education: Why even Latino parents are rejecting a program designed for their children's benefit. *The Atlantic*. https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/1998/05/the-case-against-bilingual-education/305426/

Rajendran, N. S. (2001). *Dealing with biases in qualitative research: A balancing act for researchers.* Paper presented at the Qualitative Research Convention 2001: Navigating Challenges. University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur.

Ramírez, J. D., Pasta, D. J., Yuen, S. D., Ramey, D. R., & Billings, D. (1991). *Final report: Longitudinal study of structured immersion strategy, early-exit, and late-exit transitional bilingual education programs for language-minority children.* San Mateo, CA: Aguirre International.

Ray, A., & Bowman, B. (2003). *Learning multicultural competence: Developing early childhood practitioners' effectiveness in working with children from culturally diverse communities*. Final report to the A. L. Mailman Family Foundation. Initiative on Race, Class, and Culture in Early Childhood. Chicago, IL: Erikson Institute.

Reeves, J. R. (2006). Secondary teacher attitudes toward including English-language learners in mainstream classrooms. *Journal of Educational Research, 99*(3), 131-142.

Reid, J. L., Kagan, S. L., & Scott-Little, C. (2016). *Maximizing cultural capacity: Advancing standards-based improvements in early childhood education. Culturally responsive early learning and development standards: A review of the literature.* The Foundation for Child Development.

Reid, J. L., Kagan, S. L., & Scott-Little, C. (2017). *New understandings of cultural diversity and the implications for early childhood policy, pedagogy, and practice.* Early Child Development and Care.

Rendon, T., Harjusola-Webb, S., & Gatmaitan, M. (2014). Standards policies to support young dual language learners. *Young Exceptional Children, 17*(1), 21-38.

Rennie Center for Education Research and Policy. (2013). *Closing the gap for English language learners: Issue brief*. Rennie Center for Education Research & Policy. http://www.renniecenter.org/research/ClosingGapELLs.pdf

Reynolds, A. J., Temple, J. A., Robertson, D. L., & Mann, E. A. (2001). Long-term effects of an early childhood intervention on educational achievement and juvenile arrest: A 15-year follow-up of low-income children in public schools. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 285*(18), 2339-2346.

Reynolds, A. J., Temple, J. A., Robertson, D. L., & Mann, E. A. (2002). Age 21 cost-benefit analysis of the Title I Chicago child-parent centers. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 24*(4), 267-303.

Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Rogoff, B. (2003). *The cultural nature of human development.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Rogoff, B. (2007). William James book award: The cultural nature of human development. *The General Psychologist, 42*(1), 4-7.

Rolnick, A. J., & Grunewald, R. (2003). Early childhood development: Economic development with a high public return. *Fedgazette, 15*(2).

Rolstad, K., Mahoney, K., & Glass, G. (2005). The big picture: A meta-analysis of program effectiveness research on English Language Learners. *Educational Policy, 19,* 572-594.

Rong, X. L., & Preissle, J. (2008). *Educating immigrant students in the 21st century: What educators need to know*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Rosa, J., & Flores, N. (2017). Unsettling race and language: Toward a raciolinguistic perspective. *Language in Society, 46*(5), 621-647.

Rossell, C., & Baker, R. (1996). The educational effectiveness of bilingual education. *Research in the Teaching of English, 30*(1), 7-74.

Rothbaum, F., & Morelli, G. (2005). Attachment and culture: Bridging relativism and universalism. In W. Friedlmeier, P. Chakkarath, & B. Schwarz (Eds.), *Culture and human development: The importance of cross-cultural research for the social sciences* (pp. 99-123). New York: Psychology Press.

Rothbaum, F., Weisz, J., Pott, M., Miyake, K., & Morelli, G. (2000). Attachment and culture: Security in the United States and Japan. *American Psychologist, 55*(10), 1093-1104.

Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2012). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Rueda, R., & Stillman, J. (2012). The 21st century teacher: A cultural perspective. *Journal of Teacher Education, 63*(4), 245-253.

Ruiz, N. T. (1995). The social construction of ability and disability: Part 2. Optimal and at-risk lessons in a bilingual special education classroom. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 28*, 491-502.

Rumberger, R. W., & Tran, L. (2006). *Preschool participation and the cognitive and social development of language minority students.* CSE Technical Report 674, National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing, University of California, Los Angeles; and Linguistic Minority Research Institute, University of California, Santa Barbara. http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED492888.pdf

Ryan, S., Ackerman, D. J., & Song, H. (2004). *Getting qualified and becoming knowledgeable: Preschool teachers' perspectives on their professional preparation*. Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey.

Samson, J. F., & Collins, B. A. (2012). *Preparing all teachers to meet the needs of English language learners: Applying research to policy and practice for teacher effectiveness.* Center for American Progress. https://cdn.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/issues/2012/04/pdf/ell_report.pdf

Sanchez, G. (2011). *Analyses of language and culture beliefs and reported practices of pre-kindergarten and kindergarten teachers working with dual language learners* (Doctoral dissertation).

Schwartz, R. B., & Robinson, M. A. (2000). Goals 2000 and the standards movement. *Brookings Papers on Educational Policy, 3*, 173-214.

Schweinhart, L. J. (2003). *Benefits, costs, and explanation of the High/Scope Perry preschool program.* Paper presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development. Tampa, FL.

Schweinhart, L. J., Montie, J., Xiang, Z., Barnett, W. S., Belfield, C. R., & Nores, M. (2005). *Lifetime effects: The High/Scope Perry preschool study through age 40.* Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Press.

Scott-Little, C. (2006). Standing at a crossroads: Next steps to maximize the potential benefits of early learning standards. *Beyond the Journal*, 1-9.

Scott-Little, C., Choplin, S., & Weisner, A. (2006). *Pre-kindergarten and kindergarten teachers' experiences using early learning standards*. Greensboro: University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Scott-Little, C., Kagan, S. L., & Frelow, V. S. (2003). *Standards for preschool children's learning and development: Who has the standards, how were they developed, and how were they used?* SERVE Research Report. http://www.serve.org/uploads/publications/EarlyLearningStandards.pdf

Scott-Little, C., Kagan, S. L., & Frelow, V. S. (2003). Creating the conditions for success with early learning standards: Results from a national study of state-level standards for children's learning prior to kindergarten. *Early Childhood Research & Practice, 5*(2).

Scott-Little, C., Kagan, S. K., & Frelow, V. S. (2005, March). *Inside the content: The breadth and depth of early learning standards.* SERVE Research Report. http://www.serve.org.

Scott-Little, C., Kagan, S. L., Frelow, V. S., & Reid, J. (2009). Infant-toddler early learning guidelines: The content that states have addressed and implications for programs serving children with disabilities. *Infants & Young Children, 22*(2), 87-99.

Scott-Little, C., Lesko, J., Martella, J., & Milburn, P. (2007). Early learning standards: Results from a national survey to document trends in state-level policies and practices. *Early Childhood Research and Practice, 9*(1). http://ecrp.uiuc.edu/v9n1/little.html

Scott-Little, C., & Reid, J. (2010). Aligning the content of early childhood care and education to promote effective transitions. In S. L. Kagan & K. Tarrant (Eds.). *Transitions in the early years: Creating a system of continuity.* Baltimore, MD: Brookes Publishing.

Serpell, R. (1979). How specific are perceptual skills? A cross-cultural study of pattern reproduction. *British Journal of Psychology, 70*, 365-380.

Severns, M. (2012). *Starting early with English language learners: First lessons from Illinois*. New America Foundation. https://static.newamerica.org/attachments/2335-starting-early-with-english-language-learners/Starting_Early_With_English_Language_Learners.e8e593babc47492699c220dccbf6d443.pdf

Shaffer, L. (2013). *Examining state social emotional standards and professional development related to those standards* (Doctoral dissertation).

Shaw, L. (2014, January 30). How Boston's preschools went from mediocre to outstanding. *Seattle Times.* http://blogs.seattletimes.com/educationlab/2014/01/30/how-bostons-preschools-went-from-mediocre-to-outstanding/

Shepard, L. A., Taylor, G. A., & Kagan, S. L. (1996). *Trends in early childhood assessment policies and practices*. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Shonkoff, J. P., & Phillips, D. A. (Eds.). (2000). *From neurons to neighborhoods: The science of early childhood development*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Shumate, T., Munoz, M. A., & Winter, P. A. (2005). Evaluating teacher-leaders for careers as administrators: Effects of job attributes, teacher leader role, and teaching assignment area. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 18*(1), 21-38.

Slavin, R. E. (1990). *Cooperative learning: Theory, research, and practice*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Slavin, R., & Cheung, A. (2005). A synthesis of research on language of reading instruction for English Language Learners. *Review of Educational Research, 75,* 247-281.

Slentz, K. L., Early, D. M., & McKenna, M. (2008). *A guide to assessment in early childhood: Infancy to age eight.* Olympia, Washington: Washington State Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Smardon, A. (2011, June 13). *Total immersion: Assessing English-only education in Massachusetts.* WGBH. http://www.wgbh.org/articles/Total-Immersion-Assessing-English-Only-Education-In-Massachusetts-3293

Snow, C. E., Burns, S. M., & Griffin, P. (1998). *Preventing reading difficulties in young children.* Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Soderman, A. K. (2010). Language immersion programs for young children? Yes … But proceed with caution. *The Phi Delta Kappan, 91*(8), 54-61.

Solano-Flores, G., & Trumbull, E. (2003). Examining language in context: The need for new research and practice paradigms in the testing of English-language learners. *Educational Researcher, 32*(2), 3-13.

Solórzano, H. (2015). *English Language Learners in Massachusetts public schools*. Language Opportunity Coalition. Massachusetts Association for Bilingual Education.

Souto-Manning, M. (2009). Acting out and talking back: Negotiating discourses in American early educational settings. *Early Child Development and Care, 179*(8), 1083-1094.

Souto-Manning, M. (2009). Educating Latino children: International perspectives and values in early education. *Childhood Education, 85*(3), 182-186.

Souto-Manning, M. (2013). *Multicultural teaching in the early childhood classroom: Strategies, tools, and approaches, Preschool-2nd grade.* Association for Childhood Education International and Teachers College Press.

Souto-Manning, M., Falk, B., López, D., Barros Cruz, L., Bradt, N., Cardwell, N., McGowan, N., Perez, A., Rabadi-Raol, A., & Rollins, E. (2019). A transdisciplinary approach to equitable teaching in early childhood education. *Review of Research in Education, 43*, 249-276.

Souto-Manning, M., & Martell, J. (2016). *Reading, writing, and talk in the primary grades: Teaching and learning with diverse children*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Souto-Manning, M., & Rabadi-Raol, A. (2018). (Re)Centering quality in early childhood education: Toward intersectional justice for minoritized children. *Review of Research in Education, 42,* 203-225.

Stewner-Manzanares, G. (1988). *The Bilingual Education Act: Twenty years later*. The National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education: Occasional papers in Bilingual Education.

Strauss, V. (2020, September 17). Why schools—now more than ever—should let young kids learn through play (not worksheets). *The Washington Post.* https://www.washingtonpost.com/education/2020/09/17/why-schools-now-more-than-ever-should-let-young-kids-learn-through-play-not-worksheets/

Swadener, B. B., & Lubeck, S. (1995). *Children and families "at promise": Deconstructing the discourse of risk.* State University of New York Press.

Takanishi, R., & Kauerz, K. (2008). PK inclusion: Getting serious about a P-16 education system. *Phi Delta Kappan, 89*(7), 480-487.

Tamayo, L., Rossell, C., & Porter, R. P. (2002). English for the Children of Massachusetts. *Ballotpedia*. https://ballotpedia.org/Massachusetts_English_in_Public_Schools_Initiative,_Question_2_(2002)

The Mayor's Advisory Committee on Universal Pre-Kindergarten (UPK). (2016). *Investing in our future: Recommendations to inform city planning for high-quality universal pre-kindergarten in Boston*. City of Boston. https://www.cityofboston.gov/images_documents/Boston%20UPK%20Advisory%20Committee%20Report%20April%202016%20FINAL_tcm3-53557.pdf

Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (1998). Two languages are better than one. *Educational Leadership, 55*(4), 23-26.

Tobin, J., Hsueh, Y., & Karasawa, M. (2009). *Preschool in three cultures revisited: China, Japan, and the United States.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Torok, C. E., & Aguilar, T. E. (2000). Changes in preservice teachers' knowledge and beliefs about language issues. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 33*(2), 24-31.

Tout, K., Halle, T., Daily, S., Albertson-Junkans, L., & Moodie, S. (2013). *The research base for a birth through age eight state policy framework.* Bethesda, MD: Child Trends.

Trettien, A. W. (1900). Creeping and walking. *The American Journal of Psychology, 12*(1), 1-57.

Triplett, C. (2015). *TESOL releases statement on Every Student Succeeds Act*. https://www.tesol.org/news-landing-page/2015/12/04/tesol-releases-statement-on-every-student-succeeds-act

Tung, R., Uriarte, M., Diez, V., Gagnon, L., Stazesky, P., de los Reyes, E., & Bolomey, A. (2011). *Learning from consistently high performing and improving schools for English language learners in Boston Public Schools.* Boston: Center for Collaborative Education.

Turney, K., & Kao, G. (2009). Pre-kindergarten child care and behavioral outcomes among children of immigrants. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 24*(4), 432-444.

Tyack, D. B. (1974). *The one best system: A history of American urban education* (pp. 177-228). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

United States Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics. (2015). *The nation's report card: Massachusetts 2015 reading state snapshot report*. http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/subject/publications/stt2015/pdf/2016008MA4.pdf

United States Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics. (2018). *The condition of education 2018, English language learners in public schools*. https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=96

United States Department of Education, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). (2015). *NAEP reading and mathematics: Summary of state results.* https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/

United States Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights. (2010). *Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964: Language support services to ELLs: Boston (MA) public schools: (01105001).* http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/investigations/01105001.html

United States Department of Education, Office of English Language Acquisition. (2015, January). *Profiles of English learners (ELs): Fast facts*. http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oela/fast-facts/pel.pdf

United States Department of Health and Human Services and United States Department of Education. (2016). *Policy statement on supporting the development of children who are dual language learners in early childhood programs.* http://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/hslc/tta-system/cultural-linguistic/Dual%20Language%20Learners/toolkit/docs/dll-policy-statement-final.pdf

United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. (n.d.). *Holocaust encyclopedia: United States policy and its impact on European Jews.* https://www.ushmm.org/wlc/en/article.php?ModuleId=10007652

Valdés, G. (1997). Dual-language immersion programs: A cautionary note concerning the education of language-minority students. *Harvard Educational Review, 67*(3), 391-429.

Valdés, G. (2001). Heritage language students: Profiles and possibilities. In J. Kreeft Peyton, D. Ranard, & S. McGinnis (Eds.), *Heritage languages in America: Preserving a national resource* (pp. 37-80). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Valentino, R. A., & Reardon, S. F. (2014, December). *Effectiveness of four instructional programs designed to serve English learners: Variation by ethnicity and initial English proficiency.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University. doi:10.3102/0162373715573310.

Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive schooling: U.S.-Mexican youth and the politics of caring.* New York, NY: State University of New York Press.

Vaughn, S., Cirino, P. T., Linan-Thompson, S., Mathes, P. G., Carlson, C. D., Hagan, E. C., Pollard-Durodola, S. D., Fletcher, J. M., & Francis, D. J. (2006). *Effectiveness of a Spanish intervention and an English intervention for English-language learners at risk for reading problems. American Educational Research Journal, 43*(3), 449-487.

Vaznis, J. (2010, February 4). Boston schools brace for cuts. *The Boston Globe*. http://archive.boston.com/news/local/massachusetts/articles/2010/02/04/amid_budget_crunch_city_schools_face_tens_of_millions_in_cuts/

Vaznis, J. (2015, March 30). Boston schools' language barriers persist: U.S. says city failing to improve English skills for thousands. *The Boston Globe.* http://www.bostonglobe.com/metro/2015/03/29/boston-schools-still-failing-students-learning-english-review-finds/ziq0vwPI1oeTNQcQTNbh2J/story.html

Vázquez-Montilla, E., Just, M., & Triscari, R. (2014). Teachers' dispositions and beliefs about cultural and linguistic diversity. *Universal Journal of Educational Research, 2*(8), 577-587.

Velasco, P., & Kibler, A. (2015). How can language arts teachers meet the challenge and expectations of language arts in the common core state standards when working with English language learners/emergent bilinguals? In G. Valdés, K. Menken, & M. Castro (Eds.), *Common core bilingual and English language learners: A resource for educators* (pp. 182-185). Philadelphia: Caslon Publishing.

Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002). Preparing culturally responsive teachers: Rethinking the curriculum. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*(1), 20-32.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Waldfogel, J. (2012). The role of out-of-school factors in the literacy problem. *The Future of Children, 22*(2), 39-54.

Walker-Dalhouse, D., & Dalhouse, A. D. (2006). Investigating white preservice teachers' beliefs about teaching in culturally diverse classrooms. *The Negro Educational Review, 57*(1-2), 69-84.

Wechsler, M., Melnick, H., Maier, A., & Bishop, J. (2016). *The building blocks of high-quality early childhood education programs.* Learning Policy Institute.

Weiland, C., & Yoshikawa, H. (2013). Impacts of a prekindergarten program on children's mathematics, language, literacy, executive function, and emotional skills. *Child Development, 84*(6), 2112-2130.

Weisman, E. M., & Garza, S. A. (2002). Preservice teacher attitudes toward diversity: Can one class make a difference? *Equity and Excellence in Education, 35*(1), 28-34.

Weiss, R. S. (1994). *Learning from strangers: The art and method of qualitative interview studies.* Free Press.

Werker, J. (2012). Perceptual foundations of bilingual acquisition in infancy. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 1251*, 50-61.

Whitebook, M. (2014, September). *Building a skilled teacher workforce: Shared and divergent challenges in early care and education and in grades K-12*. Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.

Whitebook, M., Gomby, D., Bellm, D., Sakai, L., & Kipnis, F. (2009). *Effective teacher preparation in early care and education: Toward a comprehensive research agenda. Part II of Preparing teachers of young children: The current state of knowledge, and a blueprint for the future.* Berkeley, CA: Center for the Study of Child Care Employment, Institute for Research on Labor and Employment, University of California at Berkeley.

Whitebook, M., Sakai, L., Kipnis, F., Lee, Y., Bellm, D., Speiglman, R., Almaraz, M., Stubbs, L., & Tran, P. (2006). *California early care and education workforce study: Licensed family child care providers. Statewide 2006.* Center for the Study of Child Care Employment, Institute of Industrial Relations, University of California at Berkeley.

WIDA. (2015). *Early years programs: Supporting dual language learners*. https://wida.wisc.edu/sites/default/files/resource/FocusOn-EY-Supporting-DLLs.pdf

Wiese, A., & García, E. E. (1998). The Bilingual Education Act: Language minority students and equal educational opportunity. *Bilingual Research Journal, 22*(1), 1-18.

Wiley, T. (2007). Accessing language rights in education: A brief history of the U.S. context. In O. García and C. Baker (Eds.), *Bilingual education: An introductory reader* (pp. 89-109). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Wiley, T. G., & de Korne, H. (2014). *Historical orientations to language policy in the United States.* Language Policy Research Network Brief. Center for Applied Linguistics. http://www.cal.org

Williams, C. P. (2015, December 4). The Every Student Succeeds Act and dual language learners. *Washington Monthly.* http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/college_guide/blog/the_every_student_succeeds_act.php

Willig, A. (1985). A meta-analysis of selected studies on the effectiveness of bilingual education. *Review of Educational Research, 55*, 269-317.

Wollenberg, C. M. (1995). 'Yellow peril' in the schools. In D.T. Nakanishi & T.Y. Nishida (Eds.), *The Asian-American experience: A source book for teachers and students* (pp. 3-29). New York: Routledge.

World Health Organization. (2006). Assessment of sex differences and heterogeneity in motor milestone attainment among populations in the WHO multicentre growth reference study. *Acta Paediatrica Supplement, 450*, 66-75.

Wright, M. S., Copeman, A., & Bruner, C. (2007). *Culture and language elements within nine state early learning standards documents*. The Build Initiative Diversity and School Readiness Summit. http://www.build.org

Yang, S., Yang, H., & Lust, B. (2011). Early childhood bilingualism leads to advances in executive attention: Dissociating culture and language. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition, 14*(3), 412-422.

Yettick, H. (2014, May 9). Researcher argues NCLB, Common Core emphasize English-only approach. *Education Week*. http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/inside-school-research/2014/05/bilingual.html

Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods*. California: Sage Publications.

Yoon, H. S. (2019). Playful literacies, creativity, and multilingual practices. *The Reading Teacher, 72*(5), 551-557.

Yoshikawa, H., & Kholoptseva, J. (2013, March). *Unauthorized immigrant parents and their children's development: A summary of the evidence.* Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.

Zacarian, D., Finlayson, B., Lisseck, K., & LoIacono, N. W. (2010, October). *Early education and care policies and guidelines for children whose home languages are other than or in addition to English.* Massachusetts Department of Early Education and Care. Collaborative for Educational Services.

Zambrana, R. E., & Morant, T. (2009). Latino immigrant children and inequality in access to early schooling programs. *Zero to Three, 29*(5), 46-53.

Zepeda, M., Castro, D. C., & Cronin, S. (2011). Preparing early childhood teachers to work with young dual language learners. *Child Development Perspectives, 5*(1), 10-14.

APPENDICES

Appendix A – Institutional Review Board Application

Section I: PROTOCOL DESCRIPTION (Please answer each question in the space below)

1. Please describe the purpose of your research. Provide relevant background information and scientific justification for your study. You may provide citations as necessary.

The purpose of this study is to explore the relationship between sociocultural theories of learning and the ways in which early learning and development standards (ELDS) serve young linguistically minoritized preschool-aged learners. This relationship will be understood through the lenses of various education stakeholders in Massachusetts, including Boston public preschool teachers and state and district level education policy experts. My research, which is comprised of multiple related parts, will focus both on preschool teachers' attitudes towards and perceptions of ELDS as well as on education policy expert's perspectives of ELDS.

For preschool teachers in Boston Public Schools, the research, collected through focus groups and individual interviews, will focus on the extent to which their attitudes and values regarding ELDS and language diversity inform their implementation of ELDS in the classroom. This includes highlighting the extent to which, if at all, Massachusetts Question 2 (the banning of bilingual education in favor of Sheltered English Immersion) influences their practice. The research further explores the ways in which teachers use and have been prepared to use ELDS to scaffold learning and development for emergent bilingual learners (EBLs). For policy experts at the state and district level in Boston, the research, collected through individual interviews, will highlight the perceived relationship between the Massachusetts Question 2 restrictive language policy, ELDS, and the needs of young EBLs. The research will also explore the ways in which EBLs are accounted for in written ECE Massachusetts ELDS documents and guidelines.

While early learning and development standards are intended to promote and ensure academic growth among all children, their intrinsic uniformity often precludes accounting for linguistic and cultural diversity (Wright, Copeman, & Bruner, 2007; Espinosa & Calderón, 2015). Moreover, when teachers use state-specific standards to create curriculum and assessments, they are not necessarily given the appropriate education necessary to incorporate instruction tailored to students for whom English is not a primary language (Daniel & Friedman, 2005; Ray & Bowman, 2003). Indeed, the role and influence of standards for EBL children specifically is largely unstudied. Furthermore, the perceptions of the impacts of ELDS on young EBL children are in dire need of research. Understanding how ELDS are instantiated in a variety of Boston public preschool settings (general education classrooms, Sheltered English Immersion classrooms, and dual-language classrooms), through the lenses of preschool teachers and state and district education policy experts, can shed light on their efficacy and relevance for young EBLs, subsequently providing a platform for change.

2. Federal guidelines state that research cannot exclude any classes of subjects without scientific justification. Will your study purposely exclude any classes of subjects (e.g. by gender, class, race or age)? If so, please justify.

No

3. Please state your research question (in one or two sentences, if possible).

1. How and to what extent are EBLs accounted for in written ECE Massachusetts' standards documents and guidelines?

2. How do preschool teachers in different Boston public preschool program types (general education, SEI, dual language) perceive the relationships between Massachusetts' language policy, ELDS, and the needs of their young EBL students?

3. To what extent do preschool teachers in different Boston public preschool program types (general education, SEI, dual language) report utilizing ELDS to scaffold the learning and development of EBLs:

a. What are their general attitudes and perceptions regarding using ELDS?
b. How have they been trained to use ELDS in their instruction, both generally and specifically for EBLs?
c. How do they report using ELDS in their instruction?
d. How do they report using ELDS to address language acquisition and cultural diversity?
e. Do they report using ELDS differently for EBLs and English-dominant children?

4. How do state and district level education policy experts perceive the relationships between Massachusetts language policy, ELDS, and the needs of young EBL students?

4. Please describe the *specific data* you plan to collect and explain how data and the subjects you choose will help to answer your research question/s.

For this qualitative study, I will collect data from focus groups, individual semi-structured interviews, and publicly available ELDS documents, from which I will conduct a document analysis. I will conduct three semi-structured individual interviews with three preschool teachers from each of the three school sites, followed by three focus groups with lead preschool teachers from the three school sites. These preschool teachers are uniquely qualified to share their experiences and perceptions of the relationship between ELDS and young EBLs.

Additionally, I will conduct two individual in-person interviews with policy experts who work at the Massachusetts Department of Early Education and Care (EEC), two individual in-person interviews with policy experts who work at the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE), as well as two individual in-person interviews with education policy experts who work in the Boston Public Schools central office—one within the Department of Early Childhood and one within the Office of English Learners. These policy personnel will be able to provide helpful insight and information on working with ELDS and/or EBLs based on their unique government roles and experiences.

The study will also look at eleven overarching sets of ELDS documents to ascertain how EBLs are positioned within the standards documents, resulting in a document analysis: 1) Guidelines for Preschool Learning Experiences (2003); 2) Guidelines for Preschool and Kindergarten Learning Experiences (Draft, 2017); 3) Massachusetts Standards for PreK and K: Social and Emotional Learning, and Approaches to Play and Learning (2015); 4) WIDA Early

English Language Development Standards (2014); and 5) Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks, including those for Art, English Language Arts, Health, Mathematics, Foreign Languages, History and Social Science, and Science and Technology.

Section II: DESCRIPTION OF RECRUITMENT AND PROCEDURES

1. Please describe your recruitment methods. How and where will subjects be recruited (flyers, announcement/s, word-of-mouth, snowballing, etc.)? You will need to include your IRB Protocol number in all recruitment materials, including announcements, online and email text. Paper copies of submitted recruitment materials to be distributed will be stamped with your IRB Protocol number once your study has been approved.

Three sites will be chosen for the study and will follow specific criteria. First, all of the school sites will be located in neighborhoods comprising at least 20% of residents who speak a language other than English at home, as determined by local census data. Second, one of the school sites will have an SEI preschool classroom, and a second school site will have a general education preschool classroom. In the event that there are more than two schools that fit these criteria, I will consult an expert from the Boston public school ECE central office who has prior experience with the specific school sites to make an informed decision. The third school site must be a school that has a dual language preschool classroom. I will determine this school site by consulting with staff in the Boston public school ECE central office who will aid me in making my selection. There are few dual language preschool classrooms and therefore it is important to be guided by BPS staff who have knowledge of which classrooms can be best accessed.

I have chosen to identify lead teachers as my unit of analysis in K1 classrooms. I am making the assumption, based on prior experience, that lead teachers will most likely have more relevant knowledge about early learning and development standards than will classroom assistants. For the individual semi-structured interviews with three preschool teachers (one teacher in each of the three Boston area preschool sites), I will employ criterion sampling, a qualitative, purposeful sampling strategy that will enable me to select the individual lead teacher according to pre-determined criteria and allow for rich and thorough feedback. My criteria for selecting the sample of teachers includes teachers representing the most years of experience teaching within each particular program model (SEI, dual language, general education). Should the teachers share the same years of experience teaching within the program model that they work in, I will then choose teachers who represent various sociocultural and linguistic backgrounds across sites. This selection will ensure that the teacher participants have the most knowledge of each program model and may have experience with reforms impacting their classrooms. I will make these selections with the assistance of BPS central office staff and the school principals who can aid me in making my selections. I will offer a $35 Amazon gift card to each interviewee as an act of appreciation.

The focus groups with all the lead teachers will follow the individual one-on-one interviews. In the school sites that have fewer than six lead K1 teachers, which I suspect will be the majority of the schools I have chosen, I will include all the lead teachers as participants in the focus group at each school site. In the focus groups, I will attempt to probe on key points that surface among teachers in the one-on-one interviews in order to both ensure my accurate interpretation of their comments as well as honor their voices. Selecting a maximum of six

participants is an intentional design, since this size is comfortable for participants and enables them to share insights and observations (Krueger & Casey, 2000). If there are larger school sites that have more than six lead K1 teachers, I will select teachers representing the most years of experience teaching within the program model that they work in. I hypothesize that I will not encounter such a large school site in my research, but in order to account for the possibility, I will utilize purposeful sampling to minimize the potential for bias in teacher selection and ensure that my data sample bears credibility. Should the teachers selected decline to participate in the focus group, I will go down the list until I find a willing participant. If there are not enough teachers to participate in focus groups at all of the school sites (fewer than three teacher participants), I will instead conduct individual in-person interviews with each K1 teacher, and will expand my school site selection to six schools instead of three in order to conduct a total of six interviews instead of three interviews and three focus groups. I will offer a $35 Amazon gift card to each focus group participant as an act of appreciation, which they will receive in addition to the interview gift card.

The research will include two individual in-person interviews with ECE policy experts who work at the Massachusetts Department of Early Education and Care (EEC), two individual in-person interviews with policy experts who work at the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE), as well as two individual in-person interviews with policy experts who work in the Boston Public Schools central office—one within the Department of Early Childhood and one within the Office of English Learners. These individuals will be selected through snowball sampling with guidance from state and district contacts familiar with the governance structure of the EEC and BPS. By employing snowball sampling, I will be able to find and recruit participants who otherwise may be hard to reach through direct referrals. These interviews fall within Hochschild's (2009) definition of "elite interviews" in that they are discussions with people who are chosen because of their position, as opposed to randomly or anonymously selected.

2. Are you recruiting subjects from institutions other than Teachers College? If so, documentation of permission or pending IRB approval from the institution/s is required with this submission.

Yes, Boston Public Schools will be involved, and the appropriate IRB documentation will be provided.

3. How many subjects are you planning to recruit?

I am planning to recruit approximately 15 teachers in total (3 individual interviews, and roughly 4 teachers in each of the three focus groups), and 6 state and district-level policy experts in total.

4. Please list what *activities* your subject will be engaging in (e.g. surveys, focus groups, interviews, diagnostic procedures, etc.). [PLEASE NOTE: If you are collecting any private medical information from your subjects, please see our website www.tc.edu/irb under Forms and Guidelines for the HIPAA consent document.]

Name of activity	# of times the activity occurs	Duration of activity per instance	Total time period of active participation per subject (days, weeks, etc.)	Describe the Data collected
Interviews with Policy Experts	6	60 minutes	6 hours - 60 minutes, 6 times	Qualitative data on how state and district level education policy experts perceive the relationships between Massachusetts language policy, ELDS, and the needs of young EBL students
Focus Groups with Preschool Teachers	3	90 minutes	4.5 hours - 90 minutes, 3 times	Qualitative data on how preschool teachers in different Boston public preschools perceive the relationships between Massachusetts language policy, ELDS, and the needs of their young EBL students?
Interviews with Preschool Teachers	3	60 minutes	3 hours - 60 minutes, 3 times	Qualitative data on how preschool teachers in different Boston public preschools perceive the relationships between Massachusetts language policy, ELDS, and the needs of their young EBL students?
	12		13.5 hours	

Total hours of participation: **13.5 hours**
Duration of participation: **60-90 minutes per subject**

5. Where will your data collection take place specifically (e.g., in classroom, outside of classroom, waiting room, office, other location)?

For the teacher focus groups and interviews, data collection will take place somewhere in the school building, either a teacher's lounge or a classroom. For the policy expert interviews, data collection will take place in the state or district education office.

6. Will subjects be remunerated for their participation? If, so please describe. [PLEASE NOTE: If using a lottery system, please remember to state odds of winning in consent form. Also, if you will be offering course credit for study participation, you must discuss this here and include the alternative assignment for those who decline to participate in the study].

The three teachers interviewed individually will each receive a $35 Amazon gift card after their interview. Each teacher will also receive a $35 Amazon gift card after each focus group.

7. Will deception be used? If so, please provide a rationale for its use. How will subjects be

debriefed afterward? Submit debriefing script. Scripts should include a statement that gives your subjects the opportunity to withdraw their participation at that time. [PLEASE NOTE: studies involving deception are given Full Board Review unless the deception is minor and risks are minimal].

No.

8. Will you have a control group? Please describe your procedures and explain the purpose of using a control group.

No.

9. Will you be videotaping your subjects? If so, please describe in detail. [PLEASE NOTE: The IRB will only approve videotaping when there is adequate scientific and ethical justification].

No.

Section III: CONFIDENTIALITY PROCEDURES

1. How will you ensure the subjects' confidentiality? Describe in detail your plans for ensuring confidentiality of data regarding subjects. [PLEASE NOTE: If you will be remunerating subjects after their participation, please make it clear if and how you will link their names/contact information confidentially to their compensation].

All of the data that I collect in the course of this study will be presented anonymously. The names of all people, official titles, and places will be replaced with pseudonyms to protect the identity and to attempt to preserve the anonymity of those who have been willing to share their time with me. Participants will be referred to in written documents by initials only. The master list with contact information and corresponding numbers will be kept separate from the data in a locked office.

2. If you will be audio/videotaping, please state how you will ensure that subjects have consented to being recorded, and if some subjects do not consent to being recorded, explain how you will protect their confidentiality. (This must also be clearly stated in your consent form/s).

I will ask for permission to audio record as part of each focus group and interview protocol at the start of each session. If participants do not want to be audio recorded, they will be thanked and excused from the study.

3. Will data be collected anonymously? Will you be able to link the data? If data will not be collected anonymously, how will subjects' identity/ information be protected? (e.g. codes, pseudonyms, masking of information, etc.)?

I will be able to accurately link the data to its authors only through the master contact sheet.

4. Where will coding and data materials be stored (e.g. 'in a locked file cabinet in the Principal Investigator's home or office')?

Coding and data materials will be stored in the principal investigator's home.

5. Will you need bilingual interpreters or interviewers, and if so, what will you do to ensure confidentiality of the subjects? What are your procedures for recruiting interpreters/interviewers? Indicate the name of the interpreter/interviewer and for whom he/she works. Submit copies of all questionnaires or interview questions for each subject population.

No interpreters are necessary.

SECTION IV: DESCRIPTION OF RESEARCH RISKS & BENEFITS

1. What are the potential risks, if any, (physical, psychological, social, legal, or other) to your subjects? What is the likelihood of these risks occurring, and/or their seriousness? How will you work to minimize them? [PLEASE NOTE: The IRB regards no research involving human subjects as risk-free. You may describe minimal risks for your study (such as discomfort, boredom, fatigue, etc.), or state that the research will involve minimal risk, similar to an activity (named) like that which participants will perform as part of your study.]

The study involves minimal risk, namely discomfort similar to responding to focus group or interview questions about which participants may have strong opinions.

2. What are your plans for ensuring necessary intervention in the event of a distressed subject and/or your referral sources if there is a need for psychological and/or physical treatment/assistance?

I am providing my name, phone number, and email contact information so that participants may contact me if they are distressed about any discussed subject matter.

3. What are your qualifications/preparations that enable you to estimate and minimize risk to subjects?

I conducted two pilot interviews; one with a preschool teacher and one with a state-level policy expert, so I am competently prepared to interact with the stakeholders involved in the study.

4. What are the potential benefits of this study to the subjects? Most research conducted at TC provides NO DIRECT BENEFIT to participants and must be STATED as such in the INFORMED CONSENT FORM. Occasionally, study design will include a diagnosis, evaluation, screening, counseling or training, etc., that have a concrete benefit to participants, independent of the nature or results of a research study that may be listed below. Benefits such as "an opportunity to reflect," "helping to advance knowledge," etc.,

ARE NOT BENEFITS and MUST NOT be included in this section.

None

Section V: INFORMED CONSENT PROCEDURES

1. What are your procedures for obtaining subject's informed consent to participate in the research?

I will ask participants to read and sign the consent form prior to beginning the first interview or focus group. Before all interviews and focus groups begin, I will also repeat that all information gathered will remain confidential and that no names will go into any reports. I will also remind them that they can stop the interview or focus group at any time without any risks to themselves or negative consequences. I will then ask for their verbal consent to audio-record the session in order to have a comprehensive record.

2. How will you describe your research to potential subjects? [Please note: if working with a population under eight (8) years of age, a script is necessary.]

I am working on a study on the perceived relationship between early learning and development standards and young emergent bilingual learners.

3. What will you do to ensure subjects' understanding of the study and what it involves?

I will offer them the opportunity to ask questions both before and after the interview or focus group.

4. If you are recruiting students from a classroom during normal school hours, what will the alternative activities be for those who wish not to participate? (This should also appear in your consent form/s)

N/A

5. Use this section to provide a request for a full or partial waiver of informed consent, and justify this request. You may site criteria from the following link regarding Federal regulations and guidelines:
http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/humansubjects/guidance/45cfr46.html#46.116

N/A

Appendix B – IRB Approval Boston Public Schools

BOSTON Public Schools
Focus on Children

Office of Data and Accountability
Mary Dillman, Executive Director
Bruce C. Bolling Municipal Building
2300 Washington Street
Roxbury, Massachusetts 02119
rc069@bostonpublicschools.org
617-635-9450
Fax 617-635-9416
bostonpublicschools.org

4/17/2019

Julie Casper
Columbia University- Teachers College
109 Sargent Street
Newton, MA 002458

Dear Julie Casper ,

I am in receipt of your research proposal entitled *RA-85 SY1819 P3: "Understanding the Nexus between Early Learning and Development Standards, Emergent Bilingual Learners, and Language Policy in Boston, Massachusetts ."* **Your research application has been approved.** If your study requires an administrative data request, your next step is to submit a data request. Once your request is received, our ODA team will work with you to execute a non-disclosure agreement with mutually agreed upon administrative data elements. Please use the Data Request Form link found below to submit your data request.

Data Request Form Link: tinyurl.com/SY1819DataRequest

Enclosed you will find a copy of the Research Proposal Review Form, which must be completed by a school leader if you are intending to do primary research within a school. It is your responsibility to have this form signed by the leader of each school in which you plan to conduct research. Please share a copy of your executive summary (max. of 1 page) along with this Review Form with each intended school site. Approval for this study in each school is contingent upon your returning the signed review forms to the Office of Data and Accountability via email to research@bostonpublicschools.org.

Your study is approved for one year from the date listed above. If you wish to continue your study longer than one year, you must re-submit your application within 1 year's time.

If you have any questions about this matter, please feel free to contact our office at (617) 635-9450.

Sincerely,

Mary Dillman
Executive Director
Office of Data & Accountability

Appendix C – IRB Approval Teachers College

TEACHERS COLLEGE
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Teachers College IRB *Exempt Study Approval*

To: Julie Casper
From: Myra Luna Lucero, Research Compliance Manager
Subject: IRB Approval: 19-196 Protocol
Date: 02/13/2019

Thank you for submitting your study entitled, "*Understanding the Nexus Between Early Learning and Development Standards, Emergent Bilingual Learners, and Language Policy in Boston, Massachusetts*;" the IRB has determined that your study is **Exempt** from committee review (Category **2**) on 02/13/2019.

Please keep in mind that the IRB Committee must be contacted if there are any changes to your research protocol. The number assigned to your protocol is **19-196**. Feel free to contact the IRB Office by using the "Messages" option in the electronic Mentor IRB system if you have any questions about this protocol.

Please note that your Consent form bears an official IRB authorization stamp and is attached to this email. Copies of this form with the IRB stamp must be used for your research work. Further, all research recruitment materials must include the study's IRB-approved protocol number. You can retrieve a PDF copy of this approval letter from Mentor IRB.

Best wishes for your research work.

Sincerely,
Dr. Myra Luna Lucero
Research Compliance Manager
IRB@tc.edu

Attachments:
- Casper Informed Consent Form__Policy Interviews-2018_Final.pdf
- Casper Informed Consent Form__Teacher Focus Groups-2018_Final.pdf
- Casper Informed Consent Form__Teacher Interviews-2018_Final.pdf

Appendix D – IRB Protocol Amendment

Attachments:
- Modification Approved - Exempt Protocol - IRB ID: 19-196.pdf

TEACHERS COLLEGE
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Teachers College IRB *Modification Approval Notification*

To: Julie Casper
From: Myra Luna Lucero Research Compliance Director
Subject: IRB Modification Approval: 19-196 Protocol
Date: 10/29/2020

Please be informed that as of the date of this letter, the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects at Teachers College, Columbia University has approved a *modification* to your exempt study, titled "*Understanding the Nexus Between Early Learning and Development Standards, Emergent Bilingual Learners, and Language Policy in Boston, Massachusetts*" on 10/29/2020 for a study measure change---from focus group sessions to one-on-one interviews. We have found that the modification does not affect the exemption status of your protocol.

Please note, due to COVID-19 quarantine, only online study activities are approved. All in-person study activities are suspended at this time. The IRB will announce when in-person research can resume and what steps to take at that time. We will post updates about COVID-19 on TC IRB's website/Updates.

As the PI of record for this protocol, you are required to:

- Use current, up-to-date IRB approved documents
- Ensure all study staff and their CITI certifications are on record with the IRB
- Notify the IRB of any changes or modifications to your study procedures
- Alert the IRB of any adverse events

You are also required to respond if the IRB communicates with you directly about any aspect of your protocol. Failure to adhere to your responsibilities as a study PI can result in action by the IRB up to and including suspension of your approval and cessation of your research.

Best wishes for your research work.

Sincerely,

Dr. Myra Luna Lucero
Research Compliance Director
IRB@tc.edu

Appendix E – Introductory/Recruitment Email Letter for Teacher Interviews

Date

Dear *Name*:

My name is Julie Casper, and I am a student at Teachers College, Columbia University where I focus on early childhood policy. I am working on a project to learn more about how preschool teachers make sense of and use early learning and development standards in the classroom. I want to explore how standards are understood, particularly in relation to culturally and linguistically diverse young students, by talking to teachers. Your name was selected randomly among the preschool teachers at your school to conduct a one-on-one interview. Your insights would be invaluable to my research.

Our one-on-one conversation will last approximately one hour, not to exceed 90 minutes, and you will receive a small gift card ($35 to Amazon) in appreciation of your participation. I would like to schedule a date, time, and location for our conversation. Are you available on (date, time, location) to meet in person for our conversation? Should you have any questions about this, please don't hesitate to contact me at 617-xxx-xxxx or jbc2162@tc.columbia.edu. Thank you in advance for your support in participating in this project! I look forward to our conversation.

Sincerely,

Julie Casper

Appendix F – Participant Rights and Informed Consent Form for Teacher Interview Participants

Date _____

Dear _____:

DESCRIPTION OF THE RESEARCH: I am currently conducting a research study on the perceived relationships between the early learning and development standards and the needs of young emergent bilingual learner (EBL) students. This research is part of my doctoral dissertation at Teachers College, Columbia University. Data will be collected through interviews, focus groups, and analysis of publicly-available early learning standards documents. You have been invited to participate in an interview for this study.

ANONYMITY, CONFIDENTIALITY, AND DATA STORAGE: All of the data that I collect in the course of this study will be presented anonymously. The names of all people, official titles, and places will be replaced with pseudonyms to protect the identity and to attempt to preserve the anonymity of those who have graciously been willing to share their time with me.

I will keep all data confidential. It will be stored in a secure location. If you consent to be audiotaped, our interview will be audio-recorded and transcribed, with identifying data eliminated during transcription. I will destroy the audio files once the audio data has been transcribed.

RISKS AND BENEFITS: The risks to you as a participant in this study are minimal. You are agreeing to share your perspective and opinion about early learning standards and emergent bilingual learners and permitting me to use that data. The benefits associated with this study include having the opportunity to reflect on your experiences with early learning standards, which could open the door to more frequent conversations surrounding their use.

PAYMENTS: Each participant will receive a $35 Amazon gift card for contributing your time.

TIME COMMITMENT: Your participation today should take approximately 1 hour, not to exceed 90 minutes.

By signing below, you agree to be a participant in my research for the purposes noted above and understand that this data will be used for my dissertation, potential publication in a journal, and as part of potential presentations at conferences and meetings.

Thank you for your time and consideration in participating in this research.

PARTICIPANT'S RIGHTS

Principal Investigator: Julie Casper; Dr. Sharon Lynn Kagan, Sponsor

Research Title: Understanding the nexus between ELDS, EBLs, and Language Policy: Accessing the Perceptions of Policy Experts and Preschool Teachers in Boston, Massachusetts

- I have read and discussed the Research Description with the researcher. I have had the opportunity to ask questions about the purposes and procedures regarding this study.
- My participation in research is voluntary. I may refuse to participate or withdraw from participation at any time without jeopardy to future medical care, employment, student status, or other entitlements.
- The researcher may withdraw me from the research at his/her professional discretion.
- If, during the course of the study, significant new information that has been developed becomes available which may relate to my willingness to continue to participate, the investigator will provide this information to me.
- Any information derived from the research project that personally identifies me will not be voluntarily released or disclosed without my separate consent, except as specifically required by law.
- If at any time I have any questions regarding the research or my participation, I can contact the investigator, who will answer my questions. The investigator's phone number is (617) xxx-xxxx, and her email is: jbc2162@tc.columbia.edu.
- If at any time I have comments, or concerns regarding the conduct of the research or questions about my rights as a research subject, I should contact the Teachers College,

Columbia University Institutional Review Board (IRB). The phone number for the IRB is (212) 678-4105. Or, I can write to the IRB at Teachers College, Columbia University, 525 W. 120th Street, New York, NY, 10027, Box 151.

- I should receive a copy of the Research Description and this Participant's Rights document.

My signature means that I agree to participate in this study.

Participant's signature: _____

Date: _____/_____/_____

Name: _____

Date: _____/_____/_____

Appendix G – Teacher Interview Protocol

Introductory Script:

Hi, my name is Julie Casper and I am studying the relationship between early learning and development standards and young emergent bilingual learners. I have identified you as an interview participant because you work with young preschoolers, many of whom are learning a second language alongside learning English. My role will be to ask questions, take notes, keep us on time, and most importantly, to listen.

Before we get started, I want to go over a few things. You have already read and signed the informed consent and participant's rights forms, indicating your consent to participate in this interview. I want to emphasize that all information gathered as a part of this interview will remain confidential—no names will go into the report. I also want to remind you that you can stop this interview at any time without any risks to yourself or negative consequences. In the informed consent form, I noted that I would like to audio-record the interview. With your permission, I would like to record this interview in order to have a comprehensive record. Is that okay with you? _____ yes _____ no. If at any time you are uncomfortable with what's being recorded, you can ask me to stop the recording.

Thank you for your time. I really appreciate your participation. Okay, let's get started.

Questions about Teaching EBL Students

1. What are the best learning/teaching strategies you use with your EBL students?
    a. What techniques and strategies have you found to be most effective in teaching EBLs?
    b. In what ways do you draw on your students' language and culture in designing curriculum and classroom activities, and in evaluating student progress?
2. To what extent do you modify activities or make accommodations for your EBL students, in comparison to non-EBL students?
    a. How do you differentiate learning for your EBLs? Can you give an example? (i.e. choose a more accessible or alternative project)
    b. Do the modifications for EBLs decrease over time, or are the supports maintained throughout the year?
    c. Do you find that these strategies help support children's language development?
3. How much do you know about your EBL students' families' backgrounds and languages and cultures?
    a. How do you interact with the families of your EBL students?
    b. How have these interactions shaped how you work with your EBL students?
4. What types of training did you receive as an education student on working with EBLs?
    a. What types of professional development/education do you currently receive as part of your job on working with EBLs?
    What types of learning or professional development would be beneficial to you in your work with children who are EBLs?

Questions about ELDS

5. What has been your experience with implementing early learning and development standards?
    a. Are you familiar with both the WIDA Early English Language Development (E-ELD) standards and the Guidelines for Preschool Learning Experiences (Green Book)?
    b. If yes, to what extent do you refer to the WIDA standards, Green Book, or any others, in designing your curriculum, evaluations, or in your daily instruction?
    c. In what ways do you see early learning and development standards influencing your teaching, for all children and for EBLs in particular?
    d. To what extent do you see early learning and development standards as differentially impacting your EBL students?
    e. If you sense that an EBL student of yours is struggling to reach a benchmark standard, how do you determine whether this delay is cognitive, due to a language barrier, or other obstacle—and how do you assist this student who is struggling to meet the standard?

6. What types of training did you receive as an education student on using and implementing early learning and development standards (WIDA, the Green Book, others)?
    a. What types of professional development/education do you currently receive as part of your job on using and implementing ELDS, for all children and for EBLs in particular?
    b. What types of learning or professional development would be beneficial to you in your work with early learning and development standards?
    c. Have I missed anything you think is important about standards in early childhood?
    d. If you could shape the nature of ELDS, what would you change or keep?

<u>Questions about Question 2</u>

7. Are you familiar with the Question 2 legislation that shifted bilingual education instruction to sheltered English immersion in Massachusetts—and the Look Act that will give school districts flexibility to provide programming for EBL children based on their needs?
    a. If yes, to what extent do you feel that Question 2 legislation has impacted your teaching of EBL students? Can you give an example?
    b. If yes, were you teaching before the Question 2 legislation passed in 2002? If so, can you speak to any changes this may have presented in classroom instruction?
    c. To what extent and how do you see the passing of the LOOK Act in 2017 as influencing your teaching of EBLs?

Appendix H – Operationalization of Teacher Interview Research Questions

Below, a chart operationalizes each research question, linking each interview question with the broader research questions in this study.

Teacher Interview Questions	Research Questions
1. What are the best learning/teaching strategies you use with your EBL students? a. What techniques and strategies have you found to be most effective in teaching EBLs? b. In what ways do you draw on your students' language and culture in designing curriculum and classroom activities, and in evaluating student progress?	RQ 2
2. To what extent do you modify activities or make accommodations for your EBL students, in comparison to non-EBL students? a. How do you differentiate learning for your EBLs? Can you give an example? (i.e. choose a more accessible or alternative project) b. Do the modifications for EBLs decrease over time, or are the supports maintained throughout the year? c. Do you find that these strategies help support children's language development?	RQ 2
3. How much do you know about your EBL students' families' backgrounds and languages and cultures? a. How do you interact with the families of your EBL students? b. How have these interactions shaped how you work with your EBL students?	RQ 2
4. What types of training did you receive as an education student on working with EBLs? a. What types of professional development/education do you currently receive as part of your job on working with EBLs? b. What types of learning or professional development would be beneficial to you in your work with children who are EBLs?	RQ 2
5. What has been your experience with implementing early learning and development standards? a. Are you familiar with both the WIDA Early English Language Development (E-ELD) standards and the Guidelines for Preschool Learning Experiences (Green Book)? b. If yes, to what extent do you refer to the WIDA standards, Green Book, or any others, in designing your curriculum, evaluations, or in your daily instruction?	RQ 3

c. In what ways do you see early learning and development standards influencing your teaching, for all children and for EBLs in particular? d. To what extent do you see early learning and development standards as differentially impacting your EBL students? e. If you sense that an EBL student of yours is struggling to reach a benchmark standard, how do you determine whether this delay is cognitive, due to a language barrier, or other obstacle—and how do you assist this student who is struggling to meet the standard?	
6. What types of training did you receive as an education student on using and implementing early learning and development standards (WIDA, the Green Book, others)? a. What types of professional development/education do you currently receive as part of your job on using and implementing ELDS, for all children and for EBLs in particular? b. What types of learning or professional development would be beneficial to you in your work with early learning and development standards? c. Have I missed anything you think is important about standards in early childhood? d. If you could shape the nature of ELDS, what would you change or keep?	RQ 3b
7. Are you familiar with the Question 2 legislation that shifted bilingual education instruction to sheltered English immersion in Massachusetts—and the Look Act that will give school districts flexibility to provide programming for EBL children based on their needs? a. If yes, to what extent do you feel that Question 2 legislation has impacted your teaching of EBL students? Can you give an example? b. If yes, were you teaching before the Question 2 legislation passed in 2002? If so, can you speak to any changes this may have presented in classroom instruction? c. To what extent and how do you see the passing of the LOOK Act in 2017 as influencing your teaching of EBLs?	RQ 2

Appendix I – Introductory/Recruitment Email Letter for Policy Personnel Interviews

Date

Dear *Name*:

My name is Julie Casper and I am a student at Teachers College, Columbia University where I focus on early childhood policy. I am working on a project to learn more about how policy personnel make sense of early learning and development standards and their implementation. I want to explore how standards are understood, particularly in relation to culturally and linguistically diverse young students, by talking to policy personnel. Your insights would be invaluable to my research.

I would love to hear from you by conducting a one-on-one interview. Our conversation will last approximately one hour, not to exceed 90 minutes. I would like to schedule a date, time, and location for our conversation. Are you available on (date, time, location) to meet in person for our conversation? Should you have any questions about this, please don't hesitate to contact me at 617-xxx-xxxx or jbc2162@tc.columbia.edu. Thank you in advance for your support in participating in this project. I look forward to our conversation.

Sincerely,

Julie Casper

Appendix J – Participant Rights and Informed Consent Form for Policy Personnel Participants

Date _____

Dear _____:

DESCRIPTION OF THE RESEARCH: I am currently conducting a research study on the perceived relationships between early learning and development standards and the needs of young emergent bilingual learner (EBL) students. This research is part of my doctoral dissertation at Teachers College, Columbia University. Data will be collected through interviews, focus groups, and analysis of publicly-available early learning standards documents. You have been invited to participate in an interview for this study.

ANONYMITY, CONFIDENTIALITY, AND DATA STORAGE: All of the data that I collect in the course of this study will be presented anonymously. The names of all people, official titles, and places will be replaced with pseudonyms to protect the identity and to attempt to preserve the anonymity of those who have graciously been willing to share their time with me.

I will keep all data confidential. It will be stored in a secure location. If you consent to be audiotaped, our interview will be audio-recorded and transcribed, with identifying data eliminated during transcription. I will destroy the audio files once the audio data has been transcribed.

RISKS AND BENEFITS: The risks to you as a participant in this study are minimal. You are agreeing to share your perspective and opinion about early learning standards and emergent bilingual learners and permitting me to use that data. The benefits associated with this study include having the opportunity to reflect on your experiences with early learning standards, which could open the door to more frequent conversations surrounding their use.

TIME COMMITMENT: Your participation today should take approximately 1 hour, not to exceed 90 minutes.

By signing below, you agree to be a participant in my research for the purposes noted above and understand that this data will be used for my dissertation, potential publication in a journal, and as part of potential presentations at conferences and meetings.

Thank you for your time and consideration in participating in this research.

PARTICIPANT'S RIGHTS

Principal Investigator: Julie Casper; Dr. Sharon Lynn Kagan, Sponsor

Research Title: Understanding the nexus between ELDS, EBLs, and Language Policy: Accessing the Perceptions of Policy Experts and Preschool Teachers in Boston, Massachusetts

- I have read and discussed the Research Description with the researcher. I have had the opportunity to ask questions about the purposes and procedures regarding this study.
- My participation in research is voluntary. I may refuse to participate or withdraw from participation at any time without jeopardy to future medical care, employment, student status, or other entitlements.
- The researcher may withdraw me from the research at his/her professional discretion.
- If, during the course of the study, significant new information that has been developed becomes available which may relate to my willingness to continue to participate, the investigator will provide this information to me.
- Any information derived from the research project that personally identifies me will not be voluntarily released or disclosed without my separate consent, except as specifically required by law.
- If at any time I have any questions regarding the research or my participation, I can contact the investigator, who will answer my questions. The investigator's phone number is (617) xxx-xxxx, and her email is: jbc2162@tc.columbia.edu.
- If at any time I have comments, or concerns regarding the conduct of the research or questions about my rights as a research subject, I should contact the Teachers College,

Columbia University Institutional Review Board (IRB). The phone number for the IRB is (212) 678-4105. Or, I can write to the IRB at Teachers College, Columbia University, 525 W. 120th Street, New York, NY, 10027, Box 151.

- I should receive a copy of the Research Description and this Participant's Rights document.

My signature means that I agree to participate in this study.

Participant's signature: _____

Date: _____/_____/_____

Name: _____

Date: _____/_____/_____

Appendix K – Policy Personnel Interview Protocol

Introductory Script:

Hi, my name is Julie Casper and I am studying the relationship between early learning and development standards and young emergent bilingual learners. I have identified you as an interview participant because you work in a policy capacity at the district or state level and are knowledgeable of early learning standards and/or English language learners.

Before we get started, I want to go over a few things. You have already read and signed the informed consent and participant's rights forms, indicating your consent to participate in this interview. I want to emphasize that all information gathered as a part of this interview will remain confidential—no names will go into the report. I also want to remind you that you can stop this interview at any time without any risks to yourself or negative consequences. In the informed consent form I noted that I would like to audio-record the interview. With your permission, I would like to record this interview in order to have a comprehensive record. Is that okay with you? _____ yes _____ no. If at any time you are uncomfortable with what's being recorded, you can ask me to stop the recording.

Thank you for your time. I really appreciate your participation. Okay, let's get started.

Introductory Question

1. What has been your experience working with early learning and development standards in your current position?

Questions about ELDS

2. In your opinion, how do ELDS impact prekindergarten classroom instruction?
    a. In what ways do you think utilizing ELDS in the preschool classroom relates to student outcomes?
    b. To what extent do you think that ELDS help to close early achievement gaps for EBLs?
    c. To what extent do you think it is important to have standard-specific instructional strategies as part of the standards?
    d. What has been your experience with the adoption of WIDA E-ELD standards?
    e. How do the standards documents (WIDA and the "Green Book" —the Guidelines for Preschool Learning Experiences) provide information to assist preschool teachers in helping all children, and EBLs in particular, meet the standards? In your opinion, how helpful have these standards been for preschool teachers working with EBLs?

3. How is the state or district supporting efforts to revise standards and implement them in the classroom?
    a. To what extent do you think policy experts account for cultural and linguistic diversity in the development or revision of ELDS?
    b. To what extent and how are the Green Book and the WIDA Early English

Language Development Standards promoted across early childhood programs?

c. What types of professional development/education or trainings have followed the introduction of new or revised standards (WIDA or preexisting standards) to prepare PreK programs and teachers for their use?
d. What professional development supports/education are provided to prepare PreK teachers to use standards with their EBL students in particular?
e. To what extent do you feel that it is important to have initial and ongoing training for administrators and PreK teachers around standards content and teaching?

Feedback and Monitoring

4. What mechanisms do you have in place for collecting feedback (from PreK teachers, program directors, and families) on the utility and application of ELDS?
    a. What feedback have you received on standards? (Including existing standards, revisions to standards, and the introduction of WIDA E-ELD standards)
    b. Are there other monitoring systems in place to gauge the extent to which programs are using ELDS?
    c. What feedback have you received from PreK teachers on the professional development/education related to standards use, for all children and specifically for EBLs?
    d. What are the state/district expectations for preschool teachers' joint use of WIDA E-ELD standards and the Green Book?
    e. To what extent and how do you think that PreK teachers' utilization of both the Green Book and the WIDA E-ELD standards strengthens children's transitions between preschool and formal kindergarten programs, for all children and EBLs in particular?
    f. If you could shape the nature of ELDS, what are some things you might want to change or keep?
    g. Have I missed anything you think is important about standards in early childhood?

Questions about Question 2 and the LOOK Act

5. Are you familiar with the Question 2 legislation that shifted bilingual education instruction to sheltered English immersion in Massachusetts—and the Look Act that will give school districts flexibility to provide programming for EBL children based on their needs?
    a. If yes, were you involved in early childhood education in Massachusetts before the Question 2 legislation was passed in 2002? If so, can you speak to any changes you think this may have presented in classroom instruction?
    b. If yes, to what extent do you feel that Question 2 has impacted subsequent policy changes in your office? Can you give an example?
    c. How do you feel about the Question 2 legislation and its effects in the early childhood classroom on all children and EBLs in particular?
    d. To what extent and how do you see the passing of the LOOK Act in 2017 as influencing the teaching of EBLs?
    e. To what extent do you feel that the LOOK Act could impact other policy changes in your office? Can you give an example?

Appendix L – Operationalization of Policy Personnel Interview Research Questions

Below, a chart operationalizes the research question, linking each interview question with the broader research question in this study.

Policy Staff Interview Questions	Research Questions
1. What has been your experience working with early learning and development standards in your current position?	RQ 4
2. In your opinion, how do ELDS impact prekindergarten classroom instruction? a. In what ways do you think utilizing ELDS in the preschool classroom relates to student outcomes? b. To what extent do you think that ELDS help to close early achievement gaps for EBLs? c. To what extent do you think it is important to have standard-specific instructional strategies as part of the standards? d. What has been your experience with the adoption of WIDA E-ELD standards? e. How do the standards documents (WIDA and the "Green Book"—the Guidelines for Preschool Learning Experiences) provide information to assist preschool teachers in helping all children, and EBLs in particular, meet the standards? In your opinion, how helpful have these standards been for preschool teachers working with EBLs?	RQ 4
3. How is the state or district supporting efforts to revise standards and implement them in the classroom? a. To what extent do you think policy experts account for cultural and linguistic diversity in the development or revision of ELDS? b. To what extent and how are the Green Book and the WIDA Early English Language Development Standards promoted across early childhood programs? c. What types of professional development/education or trainings have followed the introduction of new or revised standards (WIDA or preexisting standards) to prepare PreK programs and teachers for their use? d. What professional development supports/education are provided to prepare PreK teachers to use standards with their EBL students in particular? e. To what extent do you feel that it is important to have initial and ongoing training for administrators and PreK teachers around standards content and teaching?	RQ 4

4. What mechanisms do you have in place for collecting feedback (from PreK teachers, program directors, and families) on the utility and application of ELDS? a. What feedback have you received on standards? (Including existing standards, revisions to standards, and the introduction of WIDA E-ELD standards) b. Are there other monitoring systems in place to gauge the extent to which programs are using ELDS? c. What feedback have you received from PreK teachers on the professional development/education related to standards use, for all children and specifically for EBLs? d. What are the state/district expectations for preschool teachers' joint use of WIDA E-ELD standards and the Green Book? e. To what extent and how do you think that PreK teachers' utilization of both the Green Book and the WIDA E-ELD standards strengthens children's transitions between preschool and formal kindergarten programs, for all children and EBLs in particular? f. If you could shape the nature of ELDS, what are some things you might want to change or keep? g. Have I missed anything you think is important about standards in early childhood?	RQ 4
5. Are you familiar with the Question 2 legislation that shifted bilingual education instruction to sheltered English immersion in Massachusetts—and the Look Act that will give school districts flexibility to provide programming for EBL children based on their needs? a. If yes, were you involved in early childhood education in Massachusetts before the Question 2 legislation was passed in 2002? If so, can you speak to any changes you think this may have presented in classroom instruction? b. If yes, to what extent do you feel that Question 2 has impacted subsequent policy changes in your office? Can you give an example? c. How do you feel about the Question 2 legislation and its effects in the early childhood classroom on all children and EBLs in particular? d. To what extent and how do you see the passing of the LOOK Act in 2017 as influencing the teaching of EBLs? e. To what extent do you feel that the LOOK Act could impact other policy changes in your office? Can you give an example?	RQ 4

Appendix M – Pilot Study Data Analysis

Overarching Research Questions	Pilot Interview Questions	Quotes from Pilot Teacher Interview that Answered RQs	Quotes from Pilot Policy Expert Interview that Answered RQs
RQ 3A.	- To what extent do you have professional development/education where you talk about strategies for working with English language learners?	- There should be workshops. And, the way the world is, I mean, it's an unusual classroom now that doesn't have I mean, any, a kid that's not bilingual or trilingual. And, there are preschools that, where, I mean, nobody learns English. I mean there are Spanish teachers, Spanish speaking people, and Spanish families that don't learn English, and they…. They need to learn English. I mean I think their children are learning English, the children are watching TV and, but, it amazes me that there are people, I mean, that don't speak English.	
RQ 3C.	- To what extent do you feel that early learning standards specifically are culturally and or linguistically appropriate for kids who are learning English as a second language?	- There are so many guidelines! I mean do you believe how many guidelines there are? It's almost impossible to satisfy all of them um but I mean, in a perfect world it would be wonderful if we could satisfy every single one of them. You can't meet the	

		needs of every child in every aspect of learning. There just aren't enough hours in the day. But if you, those guidelines, like one activity can cover many of those guidelines. So, and what I usually do is I do what I do and then I look and see what guidelines [said in whisper]. I don't do it the other way around. I don't look at the guidelines and then see. I know what I'm doing satisfies many guidelines. So, I will do what I do and then I can get 15 guidelines that fit into what we did that day.	
RQ 3C.	- To what extent do you feel that early learning standards specifically are culturally and or linguistically appropriate for kids who are learning English as a second language?	- Not necessarily. I mean I think that there's a lot of, certainly the whole literacy aspect of it, um, is really geared towards kids that speak the language that you are immersed in. Um, yeah, so some of those expectations I think are unrealistic. But you know they're not set that high. You know the realm of normalcy is pretty big. But I think it would be helpful if they were modified in some way to be a little more inclusive.	

RQ 3D.	- To what extent do you see early learning and development standards as differentially impacting your emergent bilingual learner students?	- The bright kids, you know, just the kids who really are bright kids, who are imaginative, and are willing to take a chance and willing to try things, those kids just pick it up and they absorb it and they try different words and they try different languages and can even laugh at themselves if they don't know. It's a less secure kid, you know, unfortunately there really are levels of cognitive abilities. And you can see it in the classroom. You can really see it. It's pretty glaring sometimes, the kids that are so smart and kids that just struggle. And when it comes down to learning language I think it has a lot to do with that too. I think if your brain is…. I think it is really being exposed at a young age, as young as possible, and I think your brain really absorbs language. You know, if they really don't understand what you're reading in a book they're gonna bug all the other kids and they're gonna disrupt the class. You need to be able to, um, occupy their time or	

		give them some fidget toy or something. Um, and you try to read to them alone. And just try to have some reading time with them. And it's a hurdle they get over. But that is the difficult time.	
RQ 4.	- Do you think that standards can help to close achievement gaps?		- …Sometimes you go out to a program and they feel that using the standards means they're labeling what standard they're doing in their curriculum planning. Uh, it actually, to some extent, really should be the other way around, right? The curriculum planning should actually flow from knowing and understanding what children should be able to do. So I think you see that sort of um, from both angles when you go out into the field.
RQ 4.	- In thinking about the consolidation of these documents… (follow-up from previous question)		- It's very overwhelming for educators. And we've kind of um, there's pros and cons about how to figure out how to put it all together as a package or not as a package, right? So, you don't want the package to be so big

			that its unusable, um, on the other hand, if I would have to say, uh, and I, uh, this is not a secret, its one place where our agency has a great weakness is we tend to make these documents not as usable to the lay person as maybe we would like it to be.
RQ 4.	- Are there mechanisms in place to gauge their effectiveness or to gauge how teachers are using them [ELDS]?		- There's mechanisms in place to say that they're using it, there's not really been a mechanism I would say in place to say how effective its use is. And in fact, um, like everybody else in our field, and this isn't really unique to the EEC, we've concentrated more on what I would call inputs than outputs.

Appendix N – Qualitative Codes

Policy Expert Codes	*# Quotes*	*Teacher Codes*	*# Quotes*
Disconnect in responsibilities EEC, DESE, Other	8	Student enrollment form	2
LOOK Act	24	School choice	4
Question 2	29	School politics	15
Identifying EBLs	7	LOOK Act	6
Bilingualism and language hierarchy	5	Question 2	10
Disability or language barrier	10	Language hierarchy	5
Experience with ELDS trainings	12	Disability or language barrier	17
Positive feedback ELDS	2	Challenge connecting with families	15
ELDS and accountability system	7	Knowledgeable about family backgrounds	7
Influence of teacher background on using ELDS	10	Regular and easy family communication	18
Disconnect in public and CBO knowledge and use of ELDS	17	Negative impacts ELDS	11
ELDS putting pressure on teachers	12	Disconnect with ELDS and expectations	10
Influence of funding on ELDS	12	ELDS as valuable tools	7
Integration of ELDS	12	Which ELDS are used	9
Purpose of ELDS	13	Differential impacts ELDS for EBLs	8
Revision of ELDS	5	Knowledgeable about ELDS	8
Cultural and linguistic diversity in ELDS	15	Teacher use of ELDS	21
ELDS and EBLs	11	Assumptions or biases about students	10
ELDS and vertical transitions	7	Negative attitudes towards dual language	13
Importance of training on ELDS	19	Lack of support for interventions	4
Lack of training on ELDS	18	Support for interventions	5
Experience working on ELDS	9	Curriculum not culturally responsive	6
Feedback on use of ELDS	24	Teacher autonomy	6

WIDA	16	Influence of teacher background on instruction	16
Need for director support	7	Role of the paraprofessional	11
		Teacher speaks same or different language as EBLs	12
		Assessing EBLs and evaluating progress	19
		Culturally responsive curriculum and activities	14
		Differentiate learning	10
		Modifications for EBLs	17
		Supporting language development	7
		Teaching strategies with EBLs	29
		Limited to no district training on ELDS	2
		District training on ELDS	7
		Limited to no district training on EBLs	12
		District training on EBLs	2
		Limited to no prior training on ELDS	4
		Prior training on ELDS	2
		Limited to no prior training on EBLs	3
		Prior training on EBLs	4
		Goals of professional development	17

Appendix O – NVivo Coding Quotes Example

Code: Negative language or attitudes towards dual language

Files\\[name redacted] - SEI
1 reference coded, 0.44% coverage
Reference 1: 0.44% coverage
I think many people are uneasy about this, about bilingualism, multiculturalism. And you know, people from other countries are coming to steal our jobs [cries, gets up for tissue].

Files\\[name redacted] - Dual Language
5 references coded, 4.92% coverage
Reference 1: 0.18% coverage
FLEP, formerly limited English proficient, so that's someone who used to be ELL but is now okay

Reference 2: 1.49% coverage
I hear teachers too though and they don't say it in like a big political way like that, but I definitely still hear among really well-educated, smart teachers that it's crazy that they'd be learning in Spanish when they should learn English sooner [whispers]. Yeah, and not, I know they don't mean it like in a racist way, or in like an English is better than Spanish way, it's just I think people who aren't bilingual or haven't learned a second language don't understand, they don't think it's possible to be learning, for it to work out. They just don't believe it. But if your brain doesn't, if your brain's never learned a second language, I just feel like, they don't understand like the cognitive development that goes along with it. And I don't think that the way we test kids necessarily shows that either.

Reference 3: 1.30% coverage
I don't think, I mean people who still aren't convinced, I don't know how you convince them. I don't know, but it's like… I think there's a lot of teachers who don't want that to be true because then they're scared that that puts them at a disadvantage. Like that's a big tension in this building, is people who can no longer teach kindergarten like they have for years because they don't speak Spanish. So they removed positions, their job changes every year, and it's because they're monolingual so there's some bitterness. And I think teachers are so anxious about like fighting for their rights and their time and their jobs all the time anyways that, obviously not everyone's gonna react that way, right?

Reference 4: 0.90% coverage
They already have in Boston at least, like there's Haitian Creole. Some of it's kind of like too much too fast too, like that's a weird one to consider because that's not, if you're in Haiti you don't go to school in Haitian Creole you go to school in French, and I just feel like it's kind of culturally a weird decision to make. And I don't know who made it, so maybe it was a Haitian person who was like this is the right thing to do. It's crazy because there aren't even that many written books in it.

Reference 5: 1.05% coverage
What I think is that it would take successes in schools that don't have other problems first, right? Because even in this school no matter what happens people blame it on dual language. So you have, I think that they would have to see it be successful on its own. Because no matter what other little thing went wrong around it, I know so many teachers who just are gonna say well do you think it's maybe because they learned in Spanish first? Or something. So, I think yeah, unfortunately you'd need like a flagship school that doesn't have other, a million other obstacles.

Files\\[name redacted] - SEI
3 references coded, 1.78% coverage
Reference 1: 0.43% coverage
I see that a lot, where a lot of the teachers are being replaced by a non-speaker of the first child's language, and you can tell the frustration and the misunderstanding and also not knowing the culture, that plays into it a lot.

Reference 2: 0.55% coverage
In the sheltered English instruction, all they hear is, they hear a lot of English but they don't necessarily hear a lot of their first language unless the teacher speaks it. Which is sad because it's almost like sink or swim, and it can be very frustrating for a child. And I see it all the time.

Reference 3: 0.80% coverage
But there's a lot of parents that, you know the office doesn't represent the culture of the school. Because, they're good people, right? But the secretary doesn't know Spanish. So you know, in the past, like in the last maybe five or six years, the secretary would just hang up if the person didn't speak English. So there was a lot of frustration from the Latino families, Hispanic families.

Files\\[name redacted] - Dual Language
2 references coded, 1.29% coverage
Reference 1: 0.83% coverage
But yeah it's like fighting against the society in a way, and as individuals I guess it's like hard and moving, and when I go to trainings sometimes when they hear where I'm coming from, the dual language, they're like how does that work, we don't believe in that, or they don't understand it, other educators. Which, you will say, they are more open-minded. But there are some educators that don't think, that.

Reference 2: 0.46% coverage
Even me teaching in English, I was doing my practicum, which was a lovely experience but I was pretty aware that my mentor teacher didn't want me to teach the phonics part of the lesson because my pronunciation was not American.

Files\\[name redacted] - Gen Ed
2 references coded, 0.90% coverage
Reference 1: 0.47% coverage